The Forum

MARCH, 1897.

TAXATION: ITS SUM, JUSTIFICATION, AND METHODS.

DISCUSSION over the sum, justification, and methods of taxation is increasing in volume and intensity.

We, in the United States, are always under the political dominion of two governments at once, one National, and one State; but in regard to taxation, each individual may, if his property is widely dispersed, be subject to many more than two governments. If he has property in each State of the Union, he is subject to the taxing powers of forty-five States, and also of the Government at Washington. There are, besides, territorial governments and minor divisions of States possessing the power of taxation in one form or another.

A great deal of deserved criticism of the rather antiquated "General Property Tax Law" of New York has grown out of the exceptions which the courts have imposed on the early rule that while realty must be taxed in the State in which it is situated, personalty follows the owner, and must be taxed where he has his domicile. A failure by New York farmers to fully appreciate how much of New York personalty is exempt from taxation, because in Federal or city bonds, or situated outside the State, underlies some of, but not all, their complaints that personalty escapes full taxation.

Exemptions from taxation need revision, and will before long receive attention; but plans for using such exemptions in order to inflict unequal and unjust taxation on a class will be scrutinized. A McKinley tariff which puts 60 per cent of imports on the free list in

Copyright, 1896, by The Forum Publishing Company.
Permission to re-publish articles is reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order to furnish an excuse for higher protective taxes on the remainder, or an income tax beginning with a $4,000 exemption, will be stripped of disguises.

The amount of annual Federal and State taxation is readily ascertained; but there has been difficulty in the way of census compilers who have endeavored to obtain accurate knowledge of the sum of all taxes and assessments by counties, and by taxing-agencies inferior to counties. Assuming $365,000,000 to be now the average annual sum raised by Federal taxes, that vast amount is far below the total sum raised by other taxation and assessments in the United States. In the "Congressional Record" of July 18, 1894, there is a tabular statement, by Mr. Wheeler of Alabama, showing expenditure for 1890 in the several States to have been more than $569,000,000, and the total disbursements for public purposes in that year by New York and its minor divisions to have been nearly $91,250,000.

It is strange that it should be so; but probably the voters and taxpayers of New York are more familiar with the sum, methods, and the annual increase of Federal taxation than of taxation by their own State, its counties, cities, and towns.

The total ordinary expenditures of the Federal Government in 1861 were only sixty-six and a half millions; but twenty years later they had risen to more than two hundred and fifty-nine and a half millions; and the recent average has been some three hundred and sixty-five millions. For the government of the State of New York, omitting minor divisions of the State, the aggregate appropriations at Albany were less than ten millions in 1881, but more than twice that sum in 1896. They were only thirteen million dollars in 1890, but over twenty million six years later. What has happened at Washington and Albany in regard to the increase of the yearly amount of expenditure and taxation has probably happened in the capital of each of our States and Territories.

The causes of the great increase of the yearly exactions by governments from the rents, wages, profits, and savings of the country have been many. Some have been necessary, others unnecessary. One cause has been the recent tendency to enlarge the functions of the State by placing in the hands of Government agencies the conduct of certain classes of business, which was heretofore in the hands of individuals, partnerships, or private corporations.

This process of transferring to municipalities what was formerly done by individuals, and of regulating by law the relation to wage-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earners of the owners of the instruments of production, seems to be going on rapidly in England. The same tendency in our own country is to be seen in the platform of doctrine erected July 24, 1896, by the People's party. Such an extension of the functions of the State, such a transit from individualism to socialism, are, of course, expensive for the State. The bills of socialism for State interference with enterprises heretofore regarded as individual enterprises, but now looked upon as "affected with a public use," must be paid. Only by taxes can the State now obtain the needed money.

If the socialistic State advocated by Populists shall (if ever) be established, will taxation be less? Office-holders may possibly then be found who will conduct telegraphs, railways, and banks more effectively, wisely, and with more commercial economy and commercial liberality, than do now their owners,—but that day has not yet come. If such occupations as farming, mining, transporting merchandise, transmitting news, exchanging products, and banking are to be taken out of the hands of those who own or can borrow the capital therein invested, they must fall into the hands of the State within whose jurisdiction they are conducted. Either organized capital, or organized political government, will manage those enterprises. Either banks, or the Federal Government, will receive deposits, make discounts, and issue circulating notes. As matters now stand there are: first, those who own or can obtain the capital for our industries; second, those who do mental and manual work therefor; and finally, the consumers. Those three component elements have in this country been generally left to manage their own affairs in their own way, subject to the law that each person must so use what is his own as not to injure a right belonging to someone else. The Democracy, as distinct from the Populists, prefer, I think, that such condition of affairs shall continue, subject to such special legislation as may from time to time be found imperatively necessary to protect the rights of the State as well as the rights of each of the three elements to which I have referred.

Everyone will concede that our National and State Governments are not yet competent to successfully conduct those industrial enterprises of the country now in the hands of organized capital. Even the Comptroller of the State of New York will probably not contend that officials, of the class selected by the present Governor of New York, or those likely to be appointed by the next President of the United States, could superintend and conduct with advantage the farming, mining, transporting, exchanging, and banking of the country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An increasing disposition to levy taxes for other purposes than revenue has created a tendency to consider the sum of taxation as secondary to the reasons which justify the infliction of taxes. Of course the advocacy of a protective tariff, either as an indemnification of manufacturers for prospective losses, or as an inducement to put capital in manufactures, is chronic. The taxpayers are never told what sum, *plus* the money required for Government expenditure, will be needed and exacted for such purposes. Importers and consumers of imported articles cannot read in the tariff law what rate of duty is laid for revenue and what additional rate is laid to enable capital invested in manufactures to secure exceptional profits which may or may not be used to increase the wages of workingmen already in the country. I do not need to enumerate the examples—more recent than the tariff,—of taxation for other purposes than revenue, as, for instance, the 10-per-cent bank tax.

The power of the majority to take away property from the minority by a tax is a tremendous manifestation of sovereignty. The American colonists went to war for the principle that the taxing-power must coincide with representation, and it is not credible when they formed a State that they put no restraints on the taxing-power either as to the yearly sum or as to the justice and equality of the levy. It must have been that the yearly sum required for the maintenance of the Government was to be the test of legislative power. In many of the States either the Bill of Rights, or the Constitution, proclaimed that each inhabitant should only be bound to contribute "his share," and the legislative power was limited to "proportional reasonable assessments, rates, and taxes." In Maryland, the phrase was "his proportion of public taxes for the support of the Government, according to his actual worth in real or personal property." Virginia said, "Taxation shall be equal and uniform . . . in proportion to its value." The courts of New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and other States have given most exhaustive judgments in regard to the limitations of the taxing-power in American jurisprudence. The total sum is to be limited to an amount that is reasonable in the opinion of the law-making power. If the New York legislature deems twenty millions necessary and reasonable, that sum must be raised; but not for any other purpose than Government expenses.

Inhabitants of New York are not to have all their property swept into the possession of the State, under the taxing-power, if the State does not require the property to pay reasonable expenses. If it be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not so, of what avail is the injunction in the Federal Constitution and that of New York also, that no person "shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law"? which New York courts interpret as covering a deprivation by executive, or legislative, or judicial power, or all three combined, in derogation of the Constitution. And what of the injunction in the Fourteenth Amendment which declares that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws"? Under the pretext of taxes there must not be that taking of private property "for public use without just compensation," which the Constitution forbids. The word "property" in the Constitutional phrase, "life, liberty, or property," may not have been interpreted by the courts as often as the word "liberty"; but the power assigned to the latter as used in the sentence is significant in many ways. Nearly ten years ago the late Prof. Dwight, of Columbia College Law School, published an elaborate paper on "The Legality of Trusts," in which he said of the word "liberty," as employed in association with the word "property":—

> "The word 'liberty,' as here used, has been construed by the highest State authorities to include 'the right of a person to adopt such lawful industrial pursuits not injurious to the community as he may see fit.' It includes the right of one to use his faculties in all lawful ways, to live and work where he will, to earn his livelihood in any lawful calling, and to pursue any lawful trade or avocation. It is judicially declared (109 N. Y. Reports), that a liberty to adopt or to follow lawful industrial pursuits, in a manner not injurious to the community, is not to be infringed upon, limited, weakened, or destroyed by legislation."

That bears distinctly on associations formed by wage-earners to increase their wages. He adds:—

> "The right of association is the child of freedom of trade. It is too late to banish it. As mercantile concerns under freedom of trade have tended to be more and more vast and comprehensive and have absorbed the smaller ones, so it is reasonable to suppose that the right of association will be made more and more available in manufacturing. In fact the two tendencies are, in substance, the same. If association is prevented by law, different manufactories may be moulded into one. The only way out of the difficulty, if there be one, is to invade the right of property, namely production by law, cut down the employment of large capitals, and perhaps, in the end, *hand over production to the State.*"

The Constitution of the State of New York offers to the legislative power a large discretion by unreservedly committing to its hands everything which the judicial power declares shall concern police or health, subject to the single qualification that no one's life, liberty, or property

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall be interfered with unless by "due process of law," which phrase the courts are to limit and define. It is that existing constitutional qualification, and especially in regard to taxation, which socialism is endeavoring to invade.

New York law denounces as a crime every contract, arrangement, agreement, or conspiracy to prevent the exercise of a lawful calling, to injure the public health, morals, trade, or commerce, to prevent or restrain competition, in order to increase prices of articles in common use for purposes of life and health (wages are not included), but subject always to the power of the courts to decide whether or not such laws and their interpretation are forbidden by the Constitution of the State. So long as our existing Constitution stands, liberty and property will be secure in New York, if prosecuting officers shall be faithful, and our magistrates shall be upright and fearless, as now.

A startling example of the tendency to employ the taxing-power for other objects than revenue, can be seen in the reasons recently assigned by the Comptroller of the State of New York for his advice to the legislature, that our Inheritance Tax Laws be so amended as to lay the tax as follows on estates of one million dollars and more:

"Five per cent on estates of one million, and less than two millions; 10 per cent on estates of two millions, and less than three millions; 15 per cent on estates of three millions and over." Comptroller Roberts has not explained why he stopped the progressive rate precisely at the point where the theory he urges on the legislature requires an application of the whole rigor of that theory in respect to the colossal estate he deals with.

Less than a year ago, an inhabitant of Suffolk County in New York State devised and bequeathed all his property to the United States Government. An inheritance tax of nearly four thousand dollars was levied upon it, and the levy was upheld by the New York Court of Appeals. But the United States, denying that the property which had been given to the Federal Government was liable to the tax, carried the question to the Supreme Court, which sustained the exaction. In its opinion that court is reported to have said:—

"'The so-called 'Inheritance Tax' of the State of New York is, in reality, a limitation upon the power of a testator to bequeath his property to whom he pleases; a declaration that in the exercise of that power he shall contribute a certain percentage to the public use; in other words, that the right to dispose of his property by will shall remain, but subject to the conditions that the State has a right to impose. Certainly if it be true that the right of testamentary disposition is purely statutory, the State has a right to require a contribution to the public treasury

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before the bequest shall take effect. Thus, the tax is not upon 'property,' in the ordinary sense of the term, but upon the right to dispose of it; and it is not until it has yielded its contribution to the State that it becomes the property of the legatee. It is not a tax upon persons. *In re* Hoffman's Estate, 143 N. Y. 327, 38 N. E. 311; Schoolfeld's Ex'r *v.* Lynchburg, 78 Va. 366; Strode *v.* Com. 52 Pa. St. 181; *in re* Cullum's Will, 145 N. Y. 593, 40 N. E. 163. In this last case, as well as in Wallach *v.* Miers, 38 Fed. 184, it was held that, although the property of the decedent included United States bonds, the tax might be assessed upon the basis of their value, because the tax was not imposed upon the bonds themselves, but upon the estate of the decedent, or the privilege of acquiring property by inheritance. We think that it follows from this that the act in question is not one open to the objection that it is an attempt to tax the property of the United States, if the tax is imposed on the legatee before it reaches the hands of the Government. The legacy becomes the property of the United States only after it has suffered a diminution to the amount of the tax; and it is only upon this condition that the legislature assents to a bequest of it."

In another part of the opinion the court refers to the taxing-power as limited to the taxpayers' "share for public expenses," and also alludes to the right of a man or of a woman to dispose of his or her property after death. This is its language:—

"While the laws of all civilized states recognize in every citizen the absolute right to his own earnings, and to the enjoyment of his own property, and the increase thereon during his life, except so far as the state may require him to contribute his share for public expenses, the right to dispose of his property by will has always been considered purely a creature of statute, and within legislative control. . . . Though the general consent of the most enlightened nations has from the earliest historical period recognized a natural right in children to inherit the property of their parents, we know of no legal principle to prevent the legislature from taking away or limiting the right of testamentary disposition or imposing such conditions upon its exercise as it may deem conducive to the public good."

I have introduced these extracts from the opinion of the court in order to exhibit the character of the New York inheritance law, and also its real relation to the right to make a last will and testament.

It will be seen that the tax is not on property, but on a privilege; that it is not upon a specific estate, as bonds or merchandise, but on the money realized, or to be realized, therefrom; that it is upon money in the hands of the court before distribution either to lineals or collaterals. It was not decided whether or not one rate of tax can be constitutionally levied on one part, and another rate on a different part of the same fund.

The existing New York inheritance law is not progressive in its rates. It does however make a difference in the rate between lineals

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and collaterals, and does exempt personalty bequeathed to a lineal, if under ten thousand dollars in value. Commenting on that, the Comptroller of the State of New York asked the legislature: "If an estate of less than $10,000 should be exempt, why should not one, millions greater, pay a higher rate than a $10,000 estate? A large estate would certainly be less burdened by the payment of a higher rate than a small estate would be by the payment of a lesser one."

A question presented by the chief financial officer of New York is, whether a sum of money can, under the Constitution, be divided into several parts, and a different tax-rate laid on the several parts. But there is another more serious question, which concerns the reason and justification of taxation. Of the latter, the Comptroller says:—

"It has been maintained by eminent authorities that it would be wiser and less demoralizing if Government should forego all attempts to tax personal property during the life of the owner, await a transfer following death, and then levy an assessment large enough to make up for the previous years of exemption. The tax, then, would be no hardship to anyone. The decedent would have been allowed the use and enjoyment of his fortune during life, and the beneficiary would simply pay a fee for the privilege of receiving an estate, in the creation of which he had little or no hand. Against the payment of such a fee or tax he would have no reason to complain, as his right to receive it comes from the State, is by the grace of the State. Another reason why large estates, particularly the personal property of such estates, should be made to pay liberally toward the support of Government in the way of an inheritance tax is, because many of them owe their very existence to favors conferred by Government in one form and another. The Government throws its strong arm around the capitalist in the shape of a protective tariff; it gives the inventor exclusive rights in the way of a patent covering a long series of years; it gives him and his friends special privileges in the shape of a corporation charter, whereby they combine large amounts of capital, and thus conduct a vastly more successful business than they could if acting individually; it gives them the right of eminent domain, by which they overrun the interests of the individual, whether he likes it or not; it grants them limited liability as members of a corporation; it permits them to issue bonds and borrow money on them for long periods, something an individual cannot do; it protects them in their corporate rights by the strong arm of the civil and military law; it protects the lawyer, the doctor, and other professional men from uneducated and unskilled competition, by requiring a thorough course of study and a qualifying examination. In these special privileges conferred by Government lie the foundation of most of the great fortunes of the country to-day."

Fresh, novel, and unexpected as were those justifications of taxes under our American system of jurisprudence, they were not so surprising and innovating as the following, inspired, as it is to be inferred, by what happened in the case of the estate of the late Mr. Gould:—

"The estate that would have contributed a large part of this increased tax was rated upon the local assessors' rolls as being worth $500,000, and upon that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amount a personal tax had been paid. But when the great equalizer—death—appeared upon the scene and forced a settlement, the estate was found to be worth $80,934,580, instead of $500,000, with only $6,553,520 debts charged up against it; and upon these figures the inheritance tax was levied. If the above amendment had been in force at the time of decedent's death, and this estate had been required to pay its fair share of tax (in view of the evasion) into the treasury, it might have prevented a transfer to Europe of several millions of good American money. And who will say that any law that will divert to the people's treasury a part of the millions upon millions of American money now going to Europe to bolster up an effete and decaying nobility, is not a wise and judicious one?"

If the local assessors found that only half a million had a *situs* in New York for taxation, under the law, then obviously the rate should have been levied only on that sum; but this question is very unlike that raised by the new progressive rate.

The income tax enacted by the last Congress did not lay progressing rates; but advancing rates were proposed in the House, on behalf of the Populists,—by Mr. Pence, and in the Senate by Mr. Peffer.

Mr. Henry George has a plan which is not intended to abolish private property in land, but to tax it up to its full rental value; thereby relieving the community from all other taxation, and using the excess of revenue, not merely to pay reasonable and needed Government expenses, under our American plan, but—and this is the critical point—for the purposes of socialistic utility.[1]

It is undisputed that the legislature has authority to decide what sum of money is reasonable and necessary for public expenditure, and to compel each person to contribute his or her equal and proportionate share; but the object of the tax must be solely to obtain the money to defray those expenditures, which is another way of saying that the tax shall be levied "for revenue only." When that line of taxation is passed the constitutional injunction against taking "private property for public use without just compensation" will be encountered.

All agree that the New York legislature has not the right, or power, to tax merely in order to prevent marriages of New York women to European men; and if that be true, why or how has the legislature the power to tax merely in order to create a sort of escheat

[1] "A tax is called proportional when the relation between a man's property, and the amount which he pays is invariable for all contributors, so that the individual quotas increase in perfect correspondence with the increase of wealth. On the other hand, a tax is called progressive where its rate varies with the variation of the wealth itself; so that the quotas increase more rapidly than the wealth itself. The adherents of progressive taxes . . . start from the idea that taxation should, above all other considerations, perform a social function." ["Taxation," etc., by Luigi Cossa, Professor in the University of Pavia, Italy, p. 35.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of realty or personalty to the State, or to diffuse wealth, or to make the State a co-partner in the profits of one's business as well as a co-heir with one's children? Since the decision of the Supreme Court, to which I have referred, it is too late to contend that the legislature of New York has not the power, by taxing such privilege at the rate of 100 per cent, to destroy the existing right of making a last will and testament. But will the voters ever choose a legislature that shall exercise the power? A tax should not be discriminating and disproportionate, nor for other purposes than revenue to pay Government expenses. No purpose can be so good as to justify inequality in the rate and subject the taxpayers to exceptional and invidious exactions and to extortions in the name of taxation. It may be said that those who advocate an enlarged tax upon the right of the citizen to control the distribution of his property after his death, and an increasing rate of tax as the hundreds, or thousands, or millions increase, do not propose to take away altogether the right of bequest and inheritance, but to limit it in certain cases for wise reasons. The fact remains nevertheless that the right is to be limited, and limited for social reasons chiefly, and in the interest of a socialistic State. To place children in a better condition than that in which their fathers and mothers began life, is the most powerful motive which induces parents of every condition, in this country, to toil and save. No motive for industry and sobriety can be more powerful. That motive would be weakened if it should be felt or feared that the right of the citizen to bequeath his property to his children is to be taxed out of existence.

A few years ago the present Pope sent forth from St. Peter's an encyclical letter on "The Condition of Labor," full of sound doctrine and clear discernment from the point of view of economic facts collected in Rome by reports of ecclesiastical agents in every part of the world-wide jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Church. It began with the following terse description of the conditions then existing,—conditions which exist to-day:—

"It is not surprising that the spirit of revolutionary change, which has so long been predominant in the nations of the world, should have passed beyond politics and made its influence felt in the cognate field of practical economy. The elements of a conflict are unmistakable: the growth of industry, and the surprising discoveries of science; the changed relations of masters and workmen; the enormous fortunes of individuals, and the poverty of the masses: the increased self-reliance and the closer mutual combination of the working population; and, finally, a general moral deterioration. The momentous seriousness of the present state of things just now fills every mind with painful apprehension: wise men

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discuss it; practical men propose schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and sovereign princes, all are occupied with it—and there is nothing which has a deeper hold on the public attention."

It then made these comments on certain remedies proposed:—

"To remedy these evils the socialists, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, endeavor to destroy private property, and maintain that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the state or by municipal bodies. They hold that, by thus transferring property from private persons to the community, the present evil state of things will be set to rights, because each citizen will then have his equal share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their proposals are so clearly futile for all practical purposes that if they were carried out the workingman himself would be among the first to suffer. Moreover, they are emphatically unjust, because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring the State into a sphere that is not its own, and cause complete confusion in the community.

"It is surely undeniable that when a man engages in remunerative labor, the very reason and motive of his work is to obtain property, and to hold it as his own private possession. If one man hires out to another his strength or his industry, he does this for the purpose of receiving in return what is necessary for food and living; he thereby expressly proposes to acquire a full and real right, not only to the remuneration, but also to the disposal of that remuneration as he pleases."

In the encyclical were these expressions alluding to private property, excessive taxation, and the right of bequest and inheritance:

"It is a most sacred law of nature that a father must provide food and all necessaries for those whom he has begotten; and, similarly, nature dictates that a man's children, who carry on, as it were, and continue his own personality, should be provided by him with all that is needful to enable them honorably to keep themselves from want and misery in the uncertainties of this mortal life. Now in no other way can a father effect this except by the ownership of profitable property, which he can transmit to his children by inheritance. . . . Since the domestic household is anterior both in idea and in fact to the gathering of men into a commonwealth, the former must necessarily have rights and duties which are prior to those of the latter, and which rest more immediately on nature. . . . Paternal authority can neither be abolished by the State nor absorbed; for it has the same source as human life itself. The child belongs to the father, and is, as it were, the continuation of the father's personality; and, to speak with strictness, the child takes its place in civil society not in its own right, but in its quality as a member of the family in which it is begotten. . . . The socialists, therefore, in setting aside the parent and introducing the providence of the State, act against natural justice, and threaten the very existence of family life. Our first and most fundamental principle, therefore, when we undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses must be the inviolability of private property. . . . This is the proper office of wise statesmanship and the work of the heads of the State. Now a State chiefly prospers and flourishes by morality, by well-regulated family life, by respect for religion and justice, by the moderation and equal distribution of public burdens, by the progress of the arts and of trade, by the abundant yield of the land—by everything which makes the citizens better and happier. . . . The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State is therefore unjust and cruel if, in the name of taxation, it deprives the private owner of more than is just."

It may be that such a change in taxation as will lay the highest rate on money invested or loaned, as those terms are usually employed, the next lower rate on other forms of personalty, the next lower on land, and the lowest of all on wage-earning, is not always advocated in the hope that the change will lead to placing in the hands of the State the management of production and distribution, the abolishment of contract, the fixing of the rate of wages by the State, the issuing of all paper currency by the nation, and that such a change will also lead up to all the other ideals of a socialistic State. Probably such a change in taxation can be so guarded as to be consistent with the security of private property, and not to interfere with the freedom of inheritance and alienation, provided a definite rule of taxation be made and enforced,—a rule prescribing that taxes shall be equal and uniform on each class of property, or its product, and shall never be laid except to obtain money for the needed current expenses of the State, or minor divisions of the State.

The earliest Constitutions of some of the original Thirteen States declared "that every member of society hath a right to be protected in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property, and therefore is bound to contribute his *proportion* to the *expenses* of that protection." The rule was "proportion," and not progression. "Proportion" was based on ability, of which property, or its product, was the test; but in our day equality of ability, tested by property or income, has, by socialists and communists, been interpreted to mean equality of sacrifice, which means, they say, that taxes must be so adjusted that each taxpayer, the rich and the not rich, will feel equally the deprivation of the money paid to the tax-gatherer. Among the more modern State Constitutions, that of California makes arithmetical proportion and not arithmetical progression the rule, when it declares that "*all* property in the State, not exempt under the laws of the United States, shall be taxed in *proportion* to its value to be ascertained as provided by law."

Whether or not the Republican Comptroller of the State of New York was conscious of the socialistic and communistic tendency of the theories regarding the sum, justification, and methods of taxation which he has recently urged on the Legislature, the unfortunate effect may be to increase the fear which discerning men, here and there, are heard to express,—the fear that the economic State founded by the wisdom, patriotism, and courage of the statesmen of the Revolutionary epoch, cannot thus survive.

PERRY BELMONT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN ARBITRATION TREATY.

A TREATY of peace has heretofore been the postscript of a war. Nations fought their way to such a treaty through more or less sacrifice of life and destruction of property. As a rule physical and financial exhaustion was a condition precedent to the establishment of friendly relations on a permanent basis. One nation had to be beaten into something like insensibility before the two could unite in the necessary declarations of good-will and the customary bonds to keep the peace. Tradition had ordained that a nation's honor required to be lubricated with blood in order to be kept in good working condition. Both of the conflicting nations usually assured the other nations that were looking on of the imperative necessity under which the honor of each was placed to do some fighting to keep it fresh and bright. When a sufficient number of men had been slaughtered, and a proper number of towns had been burned and plundered, and when the treasury of either or both was empty, Honor smiled once more with restored cheerfulness, made her graceful obeisance, and retired from the scene, leaving the victor to have his way. Honor, national honor, has been a priceless possession, but a very expensive one to keep; the more expensive because of its uncertain character, its vague definition, and its unreasonable demands. One thing is certain: that, when the leaders of a nation have concluded that the honor of the country is at stake, someone must be attacked and, if possible, destroyed. The salutary process of a bloody baptism can alone renovate and preserve this delicate and susceptible quality of a nation's constitution.

And now come before the world two quiet gentlemen, without any swords by their sides or revolvers in their belts, who venture to say that the old practice is really obsolete and perhaps a little foolish; that war is very expensive, very cruel, and quite unphilosophical; that perhaps it were better to make the peace before the war than after. They suggest that the experiment is worth trying, and may be tried without apparent danger; for, if it should fail, there would still be plenty of time to raise armies, to build fleets, to bombard ports, to blow up iron-clads, to make homes desolate, to break mothers' hearts, and to lay heavy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

burdens of debt upon generations to come. It may be that the instinct of destruction that lies so near the surface of human nature may break out in spite of all such efforts; possibly atavism may be too strong, and the lion, the wolf, the hyena, and the jackal may still have their way; but an inexpensive attempt to save much money, much human life, much property, and to avoid incalculable suffering is worth the effort. So the two gentlemen, who assured each other of their mutual consideration until they united in the proposed Treaty of Arbitration which is now before our Senate, deserve respect and the thanks of the world for their good intentions. It is barely possible that they are acting in advance of their generation, and that their efforts for the welfare of mankind may be premature; but their credit will be none the less in the years to come. Their work is as certain to bring forth good fruit as the seed that falls on rich soil and receives the rains from heaven is sure to germinate and bud and flower. Reason must triumph in the end. Blind men in broad daylight may insist that all is darkness; but that is the result of their infirmity. The light is there none the less.

It is no diminution of the merit of the chief actors in the Arbitration Treaty that all the conditions were in their favor. Arbitration was no novelty when they undertook their task of putting another brake on the savagery of men. The fashion of submitting international differences to the deliberate judgment of wise men had become so general as almost to create a practice. It is so cheap that it commends itself to the commercial instinct of the world; so humane that it strikes a responsive chord in the hearts of all those who love their kind. Its assimilation to the legal methods that serve men in their private disputes appeals to the reason of all who prefer to abide by law rather than resort to the shot-gun or the revolver. Nor can it be denied that the majority of those who do the fighting are quite willing to forego their chances of military preferment and renown, if the interests and honor of their country do not require their assumption of a soldier's duties. In brief, the moral forces of the day are in favor of a peaceful solution of international disputes, where such a solution is possible. Boys cannot go to the common schools without learning something about war—its uncertainties, its horrors, and its dangers. While their early instincts lead them to dream of martial renown as the *summum bonum* of life, they do not in their youthful dreams make much distinction between Alexander the Great and Captain Kidd. But they are content, as a rule, when they have donned

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the *toga virilis*, that is, outgrown knickerbockers, to become and remain quiet and hard-working citizens. All this without prejudice to a manly disposition to make a sacrifice of home and of comfort when the country calls; but then it *is* a sacrifice and not a choice.

Arbitration, in a word, has become one of the accepted dogmas of our national creed. Our nineteenth-century civilization is not content with such mitigations as a growing humanity claims to have introduced into the conduct of war. War is, at the best, cruel and brutal: it is the negation of law and the assertion of force in the place of law. Voltaire was not so far wrong when he said:

> "The laws of peace I understand well enough,—they consist in keeping our word and leaving our neighbor to enjoy the rights which nature has given him. But as for the laws of war I do not know what they are. The code of homicide seems to me a strange inconsistency. I hope that we may soon be provided with the jurisprudence of highway robbery."

That Arbitration has satisfactorily stood the test of experiment, statistics demonstrate. The United States Government has entered into forty-seven agreements for international arbitration,—not to speak of the erection by it of thirteen Tribunals under its own laws to determine the validity of international claims. A simple explanation this of the fact that we have a small standing army of 25,000 men and do not know to-day what war taxation means. We pay one hundred and fifty millions a year, it is true, to old soldiers who have done their fighting well and in a good cause; but this is manifestly better than taking the same money to keep young men out of the workshop, the field, or the factory, to prevent war by making it easy.

In Europe, too, Arbitration has become a familiar visitor at the palaces of kings, and has become so popular a guest that her services are in constant and growing demand. What our example to-day may do, what splendid possibilities it opens to the world, what burdens it promises to remove from the overworked and overtaxed people, no imagination can describe. It may not,—cannot,—in a day or a century, lay at rest the spirit of violence and aggression; but it may teach a lesson that will make the world happier and better every day that it is studied.

The sole difference between the Olney-Salisbury Treaty and the half-hundred that we have already had, lies in the fact that in other cases specific instances of controversy were disposed of: to-day we are provided with machinery to adjudicate every dispute that may arise. Why the formulas and procedure should be renewed and readjusted fifty times or one hundred times to fit cases at intervals, rather than to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cover all cases by a careful and intelligent scheme of practice, is not very clear. The only possible—I shall not say plausible—ground of objection must be that a controversy may arise of such a character as to make arbitration less desirable than blows. If our national honor were concerned, it is gravely alleged, no aspersion on that delicate organ could be treated otherwise than with bombs and guns. A great nation cannot talk, when her honor is assailed; action must be then prompt and energetic. Speech was not given to men to discuss questions where honor is concerned. Wholesale homicide is the only remedy for such an assault. Thus France twenty-six years ago refused Arbitration because her honor—her dignity she called it—was involved. Whereupon she sacrificed several hundred thousand of her bravest children, lost two of her finest provinces, and paid the assailant of her dignity eight hundred million dollars to go home. No doubt her honor (or her dignity) was worth being preserved at that price; but even those who love her and sympathize with her in her great tribulation so nobly borne, may wonder if she could not have preserved her unsullied fame even had she accepted a friendly power's mediation. It is not so clear that calm and temperate discussion may not co-exist with a jealous sense of self-respect: on the other hand, it is not certain that readiness to strike necessarily proves the possession of common sense or a reasonable knowledge of what is due by a nation to itself and to its citizens.

Those men, therefore, who oppose a general Arbitration treaty should be called upon to explain precisely what they understand by "a case involving the honor of the nation." It is evident that men will differ about the definition according to their education, temperament, or the necessities of their station, if they happen to occupy positions depending upon popular favor. Brave words are undoubtedly powerful agents of disturbance, and will effect what argument is powerless to accomplish. It is easier to inflame public resentment than to pour oil on the troubled waters of popular excitement. A dispute of any kind may be tortured by a demagogue into an insult that demands instant reparation. A denial of any claim by a foreign power may be argued into an assault upon a nation's dignity. But this readiness to magnify incidents that affect interests into events that affect honor has had its day; and we may be thankful that we have emerged from a condition of doubtful strength, which might increase our impatience of contradiction by leaving room for the suspicion of fear.

The advocates of Arbitration may, in considering this objection, derive much comfort from the reflection that during a century of ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

istence, wherein we have arbitrated so many differences with foreign nations, we have not yet been confronted with a case which was not susceptible of amicable adjustment. We have never yet found that our national honor could not co-exist with legal processes. Irritating questions have undoubtedly arisen; the warlike element has sometimes asserted itself, as when it declared it was a question between "54° 40′ or fight"; but our practical good sense overcame the ultra-patriotic men who were burning to immolate themselves on the altar of the country's honor. Boundary questions have been settled, money demands have been passed upon and liquidated, we have had the benefit of the judgments when in our favor, we have discharged our debt when the decree was against us, and in every case we have been infinitely the gainers.

No case in modern times has offered a better pretext for the avoidance of a submission to arbitration than the "Alabama" case. Here, if ever, it might be maintained that the honor of the two nations was concerned. Great Britain was charged with evading the rules of just international intercourse by allowing the "Alabama" to escape and to prey upon our commerce,—an imputation which might well throw the British chauvinist into a delirium of patriotic indignation. The United States might well, on its side, find in this hostile action the material for the war-producing insult which lies so close to the warrior's heart. But the two great nations quietly thrust aside these suggestions of the Evil One; they treated the question as one sounding in damages; a verdict was rendered for an enormous sum, which was promptly paid; and the two English-speaking nations gave to the world their first object-lesson in Common Sense and Reason and Justice. The present Treaty is merely the natural outgrowth of the "Alabama" case: it is its legitimate offspring and with it entitled to the admiration of civilized mankind.

The Lord Chief Justice of England, while professing that love for peace which so properly belongs to his cloth, asks, with an anxious solicitude, "Who will compel the contracting nation to arbitrate, if she should refuse? Who shall compel her to abide by the judgment, if she repudiates the award?"

It is of course within the bounds of possibility that, having solemnly agreed in the face of the world to arbitrate their disputes, either the United States or Great Britain may be false to its promises and recreant to its obligations. In such a case, it is manifest that there is no international *gendarme* to coerce the recalcitrant contractor to perform its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duty. But this is equally true of every national obligation. Every treaty between two great nations—whether for the settlement of a boundary or the payment of an indemnity—must rest on the good faith of the parties. The difficulty of coercing fulfilment is precisely one of the reasons that makes repudiation most difficult for a high-spirited nation. If the absence of physical power to enforce is to prevent the conclusion of Arbitration treaties, it is difficult to see why the argument will not apply in all other cases. We are encouraged by the history of the past to believe that the objection is without force. In no case that I can recall has a great nation dishonored her hand and seal by refusing to carry out the decrees of the tribunal to which she has submitted her claims or her arguments. Great nations *might* dishonor their signature, but as a rule they do not: hence the value of British Consols and United States Bonds.

But, granting that so unexpected an event should occur, in what respect would the situation be changed for the worse? The original claim would still exist, liquidated by a judgment and fortified by the approval of public opinion. This at least is a risk that either party may well run, even if this pessimistic view of what may be expected from a civilized nation should be more generally entertained than it has hitherto been.

A more specious objection is made by those who express and no doubt feel some solicitude lest the American doctrine, which dates back to the time of President Monroe, should be in some way endangered by a general agreement to submit disputes with Great Britain to arbitration.

The right to exclude Europe from fresh acquisitions on the American continent is one which our people will never surrender unless coerced by force. Not only do they cherish it as a sentiment based upon honorable tradition, but the instinct of self-preservation makes it just and reasonable. A nation is not bound to apologize for her insistence upon the right to live and to grow. Her natural expansion cannot, with her willing assent, be embarrassed by the creation of obstacles which it is in her power to prevent. The rival nations of Europe may fight for supremacy to their hearts' content on European soil, they may parcel out the Dark Continent among themselves, they may lop off slices of China, appropriate Egypt, or invade Japan,—we are disposed to abide by the rule of non-intervention with religious fidelity. So far as they, or any of them, have already acquired a foothold on American territory our good faith will not permit us in any way to intervene

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in their affairs. But, rightly or wrongly, we believe that our interests consist in checking aggression when it is directed against our weaker neighbors.

If, therefore, it be true that we should, by this Treaty, imperil rights of such vast importance, we might well hesitate to bind ourselves by its terms. It might be urged with great plausibility that such a sacrifice is not one that we should be called upon to make, even in so great a cause as that of International Peace. Prudence would require that, assuming such a danger to exist, we should in express terms except the Monroe doctrine from the operation of the Agreement, or, failing this, that we should continue as in the past to provide for each emergency as it arises. It will not be denied by the most earnest advocate of the Treaty that if, in terms, it provided that the Monroe doctrine and its applicability were subjects of proper submission to a Court of Arbitration, public opinion would almost unanimously condemn and most earnestly oppose its consummation.

Is there, in fact, any such grave peril? Is it to be assumed that a case may arise between the United States and Great Britain, the result of which, upon an arbitration, might be to eliminate from our unwritten code a theory of right which is deemed of such vast importance by the majority of our people?

There is nothing in the history of the past to make any such contingency a subject of legitimate apprehension. Any argument based on its existence may be ingenious, but it is purely academic. It should exercise no practical influence on the decision of the question.

The Monroe doctrine may be treated, in reasoning out this problem, as a part of our organic law. It is entitled to the same respectful consideration as though the Monroe Message had been made the subject of a Constitutional Amendment. The fact that it has not received the formal sanction of our people does not affect the matter: for the purposes of the argument it should be vested with the dignity of a constitutional provision.

No foreign power can properly complain that it has not had full notice of the jurisdiction that we claim over the concerns of the American continent.

If, under such circumstances, Great Britain may properly bring up the Monroe doctrine for review, she may also attack any other of the fundamental doctrines of American policy. She may, with equal propriety, ask the arbitrators to examine our Declaration of Independence. She may attack the commercial and police clause of our Constitution

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and insist upon a judgment that a Republican form of government, being far inferior to a constitutional monarchy, ought of right to be abolished, and the latter be permitted to take its place. This would naturally involve an equivalent right on the part of the United States to insist upon the abolition of the House of Lords as a useless encumbrance, and of royalty itself as an expensive anachronism. If Courts of Arbitration are formed for the purpose of amusing the world with Platonic discussions, any one of these topics might be appropriately considered; but no one would seriously contemplate the possibility of vesting a court, however eminent, with the right to pass upon questions which affect the fundamental principles of the respective governments. Concrete cases, not abstractions, are the proposed subjects of submission. The establishment of a boundary line, the payment of an indemnity, the restoration of a ship, the liberation of a prisoner,—all these are capable of investigation by a Tribunal and may reasonably be submitted; but a Court of Arbitration, no more than the Supreme Court itself, will not take cognizance of a contest which does not involve a personal or a property right.

It will no doubt be said that this *reductio ad absurdum* does not dispose of the difficulty, because the Monroe doctrine may be involved indirectly, although substantially, in a boundary question affecting Great Britain and the United States. We might then, it is argued, find the right of the United States challenged under such conditions as to compel us either to decline arbitration, notwithstanding our agreement, or to incur serious danger where fundamental rights are concerned.

The objection deserves examination.

The only contingency in which may arise a discussion involving, in any form, the nature, validity, or effect of the Monroe doctrine is one of boundary—where territory is or may hereafter be claimed by Great Britain on the one hand, and by a Southern American Republic on the other. Even then no dispute involving the interests or the dignity of the United States would arise unless (1) all efforts at settlement by diplomacy had failed between those countries; or (2) Arbitration was rejected by one of or both the parties in interest. The attempt of Great Britain to seize the tract in dispute by force of arms might, and probably would, arouse the susceptibility of the United States and call for the application of the doctrine which we are considering. This has already happened in the case of Venezuela and Great Britain: it may happen again. What would the course of action presumably be should a similar situation present itself in the future?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is no misunderstanding between the United States and Great Britain as to the character and extent of the jurisdiction claimed by the former in cases of the character supposed. Great Britain has been informed that it is a cardinal principle of American policy—claimed to be reasonable and just—that the United States may, where its interests dictate, interfere to prevent the spoliation of a sister republic. Great Britain is as well informed of this as it is of the abolition of slavery in the South, or of our refusal to abolish privateering. The treaty is made *in view of this knowledge* and with the acceptance of that fact as fully as it is of the fact that we constitute a Union of Sovereign States. If Great Britain should attempt by force to take territory from Venezuela, Colombia, or Peru, the only question would be, *to whom does the territory belong?* This would be a proper subject of arbitration, and would regulate the extent to which this Republic might properly intervene. But there is no ground for supposing that Great Britain would ever claim, or that we should ever yield, a right on her part to bring into controversy a fundamental rule of which she had been duly notified before the Treaty had been made. The notice has repeatedly been given, and especially at so recent a date that she cannot plead that time has wrought a change in the views of our government. The terms of our most recent authoritative exposition were plain enough to leave nothing to interpretation, and were endorsed with such unanimity of approval that a pretence of ignorance would be as absurd as it must prove futile. We cannot suppose that the great nation that has ruled the seas for centuries and owns more real estate to-day than most of the others put together is laying traps for her junior in years; but if she is, so be it. We are not likely to suffer. The Monroe doctrine is safe, Treaty or no Treaty. It is quite as safe, if it is not mentioned by name, as if a timid reservation in terms should be inserted to show that the United States were not really quite sure that this repeated and solemn assertion of right had been heard and seriously considered by the world.

We should not forget that our Monroe doctrine is after all but the European doctrine of the balance of power transplanted to American soil. Great Britain might make a general Treaty of Arbitration with France or Germany. Will anyone seriously contend that she thereby waived, minimized, or imperilled her right to interfere, should Germany attack Holland, or France invade Belgium? Such scruples as these do not seem worthy of a great people who know their strength, and propose to deal in good faith with the other nations of the world. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purpose of the Treaty is peace: the aspiration, the interest, the prayer of the world is for Peace. Civilized mankind yearns for peace: the multitudes groan and suffer untold hardships because to-morrow may mean War and not Peace. Two of the great nations of the world, great enough to know that their honor does not consist in vague mutterings about self-respect and dignity, are willing to abide by reason and to forego violence. The gain to the world if they succeed in their noble effort at systematic harmony is great beyond the power of pen or speech to define. The nineteenth century needs only this culmination of its glories to stand out among the ages as blessed beyond all those that have gone before since the dawn of Christianity first rose upon mankind.

Above all, let us not be misled by high-sounding declamation about national honor. The only danger which our honor may run is in an exaggerated tendency to make readiness to strike the test of its delicacy and the proof of its existence. The day has come when we may smile at those who would urge us to prove our strength by the streams of blood that we can shed at short notice. A Republic with a united nation of seventy millions behind it may stop to discuss without being taxed with timidity, and will not care if the effervescent mob that clamors for blood on all available occasions shall feel outraged in *its* honor because of a generous forbearance to draw the nation's sword.

In 1870, the streets of Paris were filled with valiant men full of patriotism and absinthe, who were shouting eagerly, "À Berlin! À Berlin!" How many of those doughty champions of France's honor started on the journey to Prussia's capital? How many, alas! who said nothing, but did turn their faces toward Berlin, soon found their last resting-place before they had crossed the Rhine?

F. R. COUDERT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME COMMENT UPON THE ARBITRATION TREATY.

REDUCED to its simplest terms, the Arbitration Treaty which has been signed by representatives of Great Britain and the United States provides as follows:

There shall be created three tribunals. To one or more of these tribunals three classes of questions shall be referred.

The make-up of the tribunals, their jurisdiction, and the classes of questions to be submitted, may be seen in the accompanying table.

QUESTIONS TO BE SUBMITTED.	TRIBUNAL A. Three members: one chosen by each state, with provision for choice of third.	TRIBUNAL B. Five members: two named by each state, with provision for choice of fifth.	TRIBUNAL C. Six members: three higher judges from each state. No provision for breaking a tie.
I. Pecuniary claims under £100,000 in value.	Original and final jurisdiction, award by majority vote.		
II. Pecuniary claims over £100,000 in value. Also claims growing out of rights "under treaty or otherwise," but not territorial.	Original jurisdiction, which is also final if by unanimous vote.	Jurisdiction upon appeal, if A. does not render unanimous award. Majority vote final.	
III. Territorial claims such as relate to servitudes, navigation, access, fisheries, boundaries, etc.			Original jurisdiction. Award final if by vote of 5–1, or if by majority vote, and no appeal is made within three months. If protested, mediation to be tried before hostilities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The objections commonly urged against any general arbitration agreement between states, are of three sorts:

(1) Those based upon the weakening in efficiency of the diplomatic methods of settlement; (2) those springing from the impossibility of submitting *all* questions to arbitral settlement; (3) those inherent in the make-up and working of the tribunal as ordinarily devised.

Let us examine these objections, and see how the treaty now before the Senate for consideration succeeds in meeting them.

Diplomacy is the natural, friendly, effective, and quiet method of settling international disputes. Whatever tends to weaken its efficiency is to be deplored. The presumption should always be that a difference will be arranged by diplomacy; not submitted straightway to arbitration. Imagine the standing of a business house which made a practice of collecting its bills by legal process before their friendly presentation and adjustment through correspondence! Arbitration is sought after as a substitute for war; not as a substitute for diplomacy. It has been feared that the existence of a tribunal ready to settle international differences would greatly lessen the potency of the diplomatic method. Diplomatists would feel less responsibility for, and take less interest in, a matter which, in all likelihood, was soon to be transferred to other hands for settlement.

Thus the amount of international litigation would largely increase. Thus the efficiency of processes which now arrange nine tenths of the differences between states, without causing a ripple of excitement, would be seriously weakened. Arbitration, like all other litigation, arouses hard feeling. It is infinitely better than war; but it is much inferior to diplomacy, because less flexible and with no capability for compromise or adjustment.

In some measure, the Arbitration Treaty recognizes this, though not so fully as could be wished. In its first article, the contracting parties agree to submit to arbitration "all questions in difference between them which they may fail to adjust by diplomatic negotiation." Here the presumption is expressed that diplomacy will have been tried. That is right and wise. But there is an underlying presumption that diplomacy will fail. That is a fault inherent in the arbitration principle. Possibly it might be minimized by excluding the first class of differences, the minor claims, which neither country would fight over in any case. Or where individual, rather than national, claims are being pressed, the cost of arbitration could be deducted from the amount recovered. Or a certain delay might be compulsory, before recourse

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was had to a treaty tribunal, during which the state departments must try to effect a settlement. Perhaps in some such way as this, the too free use of the international tribunal could be checked, and the methods now effectively employed could be preserved.

It has often been urged that no nation can afford to tie its hands in advance, by submitting to arbitration all possible questions, including those which involve its national policy, its national honor, its national life. To do so would be a surrender of national sovereignty in its highest expression, a waiver of that right of self-defence which is the first law of nations. This is fully recognized by the Treaty. It specifies the classes of questions which shall be submitted. These are: pecuniary claims; differences involving rights, under treaty or international law; territorial claims. By inference, all other questions are held to be incapable of submission; those involving national policy amongst them. So that we may direct the search-light of the Monroe doctrine at will upon this continent; we may declare British aggression upon Patagonia dangerous to our safety and free institutions, without the risk of being brought to book before a court of arbitration.

On the other hand the Treaty does require the submission of just those differences the like of which the two nations have already so often arbitrated. Fishery disputes, as at Halifax; pecuniary claims, as at Geneva; boundaries, as in the San Juan case—all such must be referred to the new tribunal, if not otherwise settled, and very properly. They are questions of law, or fact, or treaty interpretation, usually capable of this kind of settlement. A few cases perhaps remain where national policy and treaty obligations are so intermingled that they ought not to be, as they seem to be, included amongst the differences to be finally decided by Tribunal B. For example, under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, the United States binds itself to abstain from exclusive control over an isthmian canal in Central America; nevertheless the prevalent national belief is that such exclusive control is our prerogative and our policy. Here a question of policy, under the guise of a right under treaty, might be referred for final decision. For myself, I am strongly inclined to the opinion that the proper status of any canal across Central America will be found to be its neutralization, guaranteed by the commercial powers. But its disposition is certainly a question of policy open to argument; and very likely the Senate may withdraw this particular case from the operation of the Treaty.

Turn now to the third class of objections to any permanent arbitration agreement—those relating to the framing and working of its machinery.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is here that the Treaty deserves most praise and confidence. It is an ingenious, and should prove a successful, attempt to substitute the judgment of a court for the self-pronounced judgment of a people. It does this, not by promising an award, but by furnishing a trial. All pecuniary claims are, it is true, to be finally disposed of by it. The same is true of differences growing out of rights whether under treaty or the general law of nations. But a majority of the serious cases which may arise, which are called territorial claims by the Treaty, and include questions of access, navigation, fisheries, boundaries,—in fact most of those rights for which a nation would go to war,—must go to trial, but with no certainty of a final judgment.

Through this failure to ensure a binding verdict, paradoxically enough, the Treaty is strong where it seems to be weak. It is safe, because it does not attempt too much. It bids fair to be effective, because it does not promise efficiency. It is a hopeful attempt at arbitration, although technically speaking not arbitration at all; for the very essence of arbitration lies in the finality of its award. What it offers is a refuge from popular excitement,—the chance of a settlement, the certainty of a breathing spell. What it does *not* offer is a binding award on all the questions between its members, to fit like a strait-jacket upon the body politic and tempt it irresistibly sometimes to break the bonds. Notice the procedure in the third class of cases. If the award is unanimous or made by a vote of five to one, it is final. But if made by any less majority it may be protested, and is "of no validity." The next step is a recourse to mediation; which is the offer of good advice with no obligation to take it. Then diplomacy may try its hand again. Finally, the question may be put to the arbitrament of war.

In this chain of processes a final award is reached, if the matter in dispute is clear to an overwhelming majority of the Tribunal. But the certainty remains that if the question has elements of doubt in it, two out of the three judges who comprise each half of the court can and will prevent a verdict. For in matters essential yet uncertain they will retain their national bias and point of view. Nationality and human nature are stronger than the judicial temperament. It has always been so: it is even desirable that it should be so. We may safely conclude that the framers of the Treaty relied upon this fact in inserting this provision; and did so to prevent the infinite risk of a break-down of machinery, in case a beaten litigant refused to accept the award. They rested upon the presumption of peace which it contains; not upon the strength and completeness of its procedure.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Criticism there may be of this and that detail. No code of international law exists to guide the Tribunals. The judges who are to form Tribunal C. are already overburdened. The method of naming the umpires may prove clumsy or bad. Still, such objections as these are overshadowed and outbalanced by the strong probability that the plan would work. It would prevent war scares, because the popular mind,—always ready to take fright or to take fire,—would be conscious of various and lengthy processes which must precede war; and the popular interest soon tires. It would tend to prevent war, because it ensures a trial of most differences, gathers light upon them from several quarters, prevents action in hot blood, and presupposes peace. Being an experiment, to last for five years only unless proved satisfactory, it is a working basis upon which to build. It does not imperil the arbitration principle by attempting too much. It is a step—a considerable step—toward a better order of things.

When mountain-climbers reach ice they put on the rope, and, cutting step after step, slowly and carefully mount to their goal: they do not risk all by a hasty scramble up the incline.

Here are two nations, in speech, in laws, in blood, in institutions, in ideals, akin. Together they climb the slippery slopes of the Mount of Lasting Peace and Brotherhood. With this Treaty they rope themselves together. The step-cutting has begun. The ascent is slow; but if it be made sure, who can venture to set a limit to their upward progress.

THEODORE S. WOOLSEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECENT TRIUMPHS IN MEDICINE AND SURGERY.

If it be true that happiness is the negative result of freedom from pain and its incident condition, sickness, medicine has during the past decade or two added more to the substantial welfare of mankind than any of the sciences that have so lavishly ministered to human needs. Whatever may be the theory regarding the real means of bettering the condition of humanity, the records of alleviation of suffering and prolongation of life challenge the endorsement of every unprejudiced observer.

The history of the various improvements in the healing art made within the past few years reads like a fairy tale, and has so interested such as study passing events that it has become a part of the common knowledge of the people. For the obvious reason that the brilliant results of operative procedure are so easily demonstrated, they are the better understood and appreciated. All the recent possibilities of cure in this direction are in the main due to the principle of cleanliness in wound-treatment,—a doctrine entirely unknown previous to thirty years ago. The elaboration and establishment of this principle, due to Prof. Joseph Lister (formerly of Edinburgh, and now Lord Lister, of London), marked an era in surgery which was scarcely second in importance to that of the discovery of etherization. Both opened up new fields of successful endeavor which had before been impossible. Ether banished pain from the operating-table, and antisepsis prevented wound-infection. In olden times, before the advent of anæsthesia, many of what are now called simpler operations were followed by death from shock to the writhing patient, or by blood-poisoning from the infliction of comparatively trivial wounds. In former days abdominal operations were never attempted, because even accidental wounds of internal tissues were followed by poisonously destructful inflammations. Now the cavity is virtually a thoroughfare, every portion of which is invaded with impunity, and all operations upon which may be followed by recovery.

It cannot be said that the older surgeons were not earnest in their study of the apparent relation of cause and effect, and did not do their utmost to reconcile the presumable conditions of failure with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then prevalent theories of wound-treatment. It was generally admitted that some mysterious agency was at work, either in the surroundings, the state of the patient, the character and position of the wound, or possibly in the air itself,—one or other of which barred all efforts at progress. Strange as it may seem in the light of recent events, the actual condition of the wound was scarcely considered in the mistaken effort to attend to everything else. Walls of hospital wards were scrubbed and repainted; supposed carriers of infection, either in the shape of nurses or medical attendants, were denied contact with patients; soiled wound-dressings were burned; and even instruments, proved by repeated trials to have been poisoned, were destroyed,—but all to no apparent purpose. Cleansing of the wound itself was almost a surgical heresy. According to the prevailing theories of the day, it was believed that interference with the discharges would prevent proper healing. Fouled bandages were therefore the rule; and the thicker and more abundant the discharges the more "laudable" they were considered to be. Hence in the older works on surgery the so-called "laudable" pus was as much a sign of safety as it is now of danger.

Cleanliness of instruments, now a prime consideration, was then entirely ignored. Oftentimes the same instruments would be used at different times upon the dead as well as upon the living body; and a celebrated operator of that day was accustomed to hold his knife between his teeth, when his hands were temporarily employed in the wound. If a cut healed rapidly it was a rarity sufficiently great to court comment. Now the exact opposite is the fact. The former result was rather an accident of cleanliness than the deliberate acknowledgment of what should have been the rule. Consequently the most careful surgeons—those who possessed instinctive habits of neatness and cleanliness — were the most successful. Valentine Mott, the Nestor of surgery in his day, was particularly exemplary in this respect. The care of his hands and instruments was a subject of jocular remark among his friends. He always washed his hands before and after handling a patient. An amusing anecdote of his laudable habit is related of him by a late assistant. Just before starting to make his calls, a patient presented himself having an abscess which required incision. The great surgeon saw at once what was necessary and asked his assistant to operate. Although he did not intend to touch the patient he rather absent-mindedly washed his hands. While the operation was in progress Dr. Mott stood at a safe

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distance from any possible contamination, with his hands behind him, and when all was over, carefully removing his snow-white cuffs, he yielded to his uncontrollable propensity for a final ablution, although to him the operation in question was an entirely imaginary one.

The very simplicity of the idea that mere cleanliness was the promise of success in the treatment of wounds was offset by its apparent absurdity. The theory that infection was due to poisonous microscopic organisms, directly or indirectly conveyed to the raw surfaces, was duly scouted by all such as were wedded to the then prevalent methods. The new-school men were derisively styled "bug-hunters" and were duly pitied on account of their strange delusion. Fortunately the leader of the new movement, having the idea fixed in his Scotch brain by the slow-and-sure corkscrew method, was more than willing to test the eradicating propensities of his numerous opponents. It was a question whether or not the conviction would loosen, or, holding its own, would bring his head with it. There is now but one answer to his valiantly persistent missionary work; and the name of Lister is gratefully associated with one of the grandest scientific advances of the nineteenth century.

The initiative efforts to reduce the theory to a rational working basis were necessarily crude and largely empirical; but the main considerations were kept constantly in view. The ultimate result has been that of simplification of procedure. While in earlier days every effort was made to destroy all poisonous organisms that might accidentally invade wounds, the principal aim now is to eliminate the possibility of any infection whatever. Thus what was called antiseptic surgery has now given place to aseptic surgery. By the latter method, which insures absolute cleanliness of the wound, of the instrument, of the operator, and of the dressings, both before, during, and after the operation, there is a guarantee of protection against infection which is well-nigh absolute. The general principles upon which such procedures are based are now so simple and so broad that they can be very successfully carried out by very ordinary means. Many of the germicides previously believed to be infallible are now replaced by the comparatively few proved to be trustworthy. The dressings are more carefully sterilized and more effectually sealed than formerly; while the preliminary washing of the hands, the careful ablution of the patient, and the thorough steaming of the instruments rightly elevate cleanliness to the position of a high art, and the surety of safe and rapid healing to a foregone conclusion. What, under other circum-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stances, would appear to be mere fussiness of scrubbing fingers, of immersing hands in aseptic fluids, of lathering and irrigating the operation-field, are now as much the essentials of a successful operation as are the manipulative skill, the anatomical accuracy, and the cool daring of the most skilful surgeon. In times gone by the essential qualities of the surgeon were supposed to be a lion's heart, an eagle's eye, and a lady's hand; but now we can attribute his best successes to that synonym of godliness which, better than all other qualifications, fits him for his higher ministrations.

With the advent of aseptic surgery, better opportunities were offered for more extensive and more radical operative ventures. The causes of previous failures being understood, the proper precautions against the possibility of their recurrence were more intelligently considered. It became with the surgeon more a question of conscience as to cleanliness than even skill with the knife. Hence new fields were opened to him. The abdominal cavity could now be opened with impunity; and the other formerly unexplored territories of the interior of the body paid willing and docile tribute to the daring and genius of brilliant work. It is almost impossible to calculate the number of lives saved in this field alone, which would otherwise have been sacrificed to previous incapacity. The possibilities of abdominal surgery have ceased to astonish the most casual observer. Every internal organ has paid its obedient allegiance to the knife, and has acknowledged the magic of its master-touch. Interrupted and obstructed intestinal channels have found new courses by the skilful union of adjacent coils; and the stomach itself has been compelled to maintain its functions, either through artificial external openings, or by neighborly understanding with attached intestinal loops. The gall-bladder has been opened and emptied externally, new currents have been made for the bile, and even the organ itself has been removed with the best results. The floating kidney has been successfully moored to its legitimate anchorage by stitching to the back; and, when so diseased as to be past redemption, it has been extirpated, resignedly shifting its functional responsibilities upon its obliging twin.

Even independently of the knife the hitherto hidden entrenchments of mortality have been revealed by the electric light, which has opened for intelligent inspection and successful invasion the interiors of all the hollow organs.

A still greater revelation was in store for workers in such fields, more especially for such as were in search of more marvellous meth-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ods. It is scarcely more than a twelvemonth since Röntgen of Wurzburg cheated reason and tricked prophecy by demonstrating the miracle of the X-ray. With the first announcement of the discovery came the application of the new light to the needs of surgery. The skeleton was laid bare in the warm and breathing body; and, for the first time, photographing the hitherto invisible was an overpowering fact. It is not necessary to speak of the world-wide astonishment with which this new discovery was received, nor of its probable benefit to the medicine and surgery of the future. In the enthusiasm of anticipation the possibilities of good appeared to be almost unbounded; but in the light of actually demonstrated results we must needs cultivate patience and perfect methods. Thus far the bones in the living subject have been very clearly and beautifully shown through various thicknesses of super-imposed solids; but expectations in other directions have not yet been realized. Opacity has lifted its veil and has approvingly blinked at the new light, but has not yet yielded absolute homage. Much more is yet to be accomplished. Although solid bodies of differing density have been duly located in the various tissues and cavities; though bullets, coins, and needles have by such means been discovered and removed, the outlines of the internal organs have not been so accurately rendered as was at first anticipated. This is in the main due to the want of distinctness in the demonstration of substance, and to the lack of sharpness of outline.

The best results so far from the X-ray have been obtained in cases of dislocated bones, of fractures, and in the discovery of imbedded bullets. In the present aspect of such accomplished facts there is a melancholy retrospect associated with the lost missile in the body of the lamented Garfield. All the devices known at that time were of no avail in locating the bullet. It was believed, and was thought to have been proven, that it had taken a downward course and lodged in the right groin; whereas, in reality it traversed the body in an entirely different direction, through the spinal column, and at the autopsy was discovered behind the region of the stomach on the left side. With the Röntgen ray the whereabouts of the truant could doubtless have been accurately determined, and a successful operation for its dislodgement might have been possible.

Although chloroform and ether—long the absolute safeguards against the most acute pains of major operations—fulfilled all special indications, there was always felt a pressing need for some pain-destroyer that should have merely a local action. Then came cocaine to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claim her crown. The discovery of its marvellous power to limit areas of anæsthesia without loss of consciousness settled all questions of pain in operations, great or small. The credit of bringing this wonderful drug to the attention of the profession is properly tendered to Dr. Carl Koller. Now the gap between the toleration of extreme agony and the endurance of lesser pains is so completely closed over by the dropping of cocaine on the eyeball, or by the direct injection of the solution under the skin, that the patient can witness the operation on himself in the surprise of entire absence of sensation, and can truthfully ask, "O pain, where is thy victory? O blade, where is thy sting?"

Many of the eye-operations which formerly required etherization are now performed with cocaine; obviating the discomforts and risks of general anæsthesia without adding to the shock of the patient. Its efficacy in abolishing pain of mucous surfaces admits of no question. In the earlier days of its use for that purpose it rose to world-wide fame when it touched the aching throat of General Grant and bade his pain be still. It came in time for him as it has for thousands of similar sufferers since.

With the perfection of operative procedures comes the consideration of the advances made in the comparatively new department of brain-surgery. As the result of long and careful observation of various nervous phenomena associated with head-injuries and as the outcome of much experimentation upon the lower animals, it has been finally demonstrated that the brain is merely a collection of nerve-centres, each one of which presides over a particular part of the body. Thus a tumor, a blood-clot, or other cause of pressure, can be located by the paralyzing effects produced upon the different supply-nerves connected with the affected centre; and many daring and successful operations can be performed for the relief of conditions which only a few years ago were considered as beyond hope. Many of the brain-regions are now so accurately delineated by schematic charts that any trained observer can, by the attendant and reflected symptoms of localized cerebral derangement, as surely locate the source of trouble as one who receives a message directly from a storm-centre. The signals are thrown out all along the line of nervous distribution throughout the body. Each one is special in its kind, and distinct in its significance of danger; whether manifested in the dropped lid, dilated pupil, limp limb, staggering gait, numbed tongue, slowing breath-pant, or wild delirium.

In a general way, it may be said that medicine has advanced, as has surgery, by following the lead of bacteriological investigation, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by applying the results of laboratory experimentation. The improvements of microscopical technique, made possible by the perfection of lenses and the use of stains for distinguishing differences of reaction in the diagnosis of micro-organisms, have opened up a wide field for future inquiry and promising progress. Especially can this much be said concerning the laudable endeavors made in many directions for ascertaining the real causes of disease, the successful efforts toward isolating them, and the hopeful prospect of eventually overcoming their destructive tendencies. In the previous attempts to reconcile the relations of cause and effect in the propagation of the communicable ailments, various theories were advanced concerning what was acknowledged as at best a mysterious agency; but of the poison itself nothing was definitely known until the microscope turned its searching eye upon the hitherto unseen horizon of the lesser world. It was then proved that many of the lowest micro-organisms held the balance of power with the highest creations in determining the life-limit. Thus we find in many of the commoner diseases that there is a special causative microbe for each. The familiar examples are those of typhoid and malarial fevers, diphtheria, cholera, and pulmonary consumption. It will not serve the particular purpose of this article to give a history of the ingenious experiments and the long and arduous labors of the different discoverers; but it is just and proper to group in the honor list the names of Pasteur, Roux, Strauss, Metchnikoff, and Bouchard of Paris; Koch, Fränkel, Behring, Klebs, and Loeffler of Germany, and Kitasato of Japan.

It was originally believed that the microbes were the direct active agents in poisoning the system, until it was demonstrated that the really morbific agency was due to the chemical product excreted by the micro-organisms themselves. Koch was at first led to suppose that his lymph, which represented the toxin of tuberculosis, would of itself destroy the tubercle bacillus in the living body. It was unfortunate for the future development of a more reasonable theory that the daily press so prematurely took the matter in hand, and placed what should have been a purely scientific question beyond the pale of possible explanation or reasonable argument. It, however, drew attention to new theories of cure which have since been practically demonstrated.

The next most natural step, after allowing the impossibility of killing the microbe, was to protect the body against its ravages by increasing the vital resistance of the patient. This was the inception of the serum treatment of infectious diseases, so strikingly exemplified nowadays by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the use of antitoxin in diphtheria. The remedy, as its name implies, is intended to counteract the poison of the disease, and is the basis of a most plausible theory for the successful management of all similar affections. It may not be uninteresting in this connection to explain in a non-technical way how anti-toxins are obtained and how they are supposed to act. Taking the diphtheria product, for instance, the first step is to obtain the poison from the membrane by means of a sterilized platinum rod and to transfer it to what is known as a cultivating medium. In the latter the microbes propagate. Subsequently, by filtration, the real toxin is obtained and is then used for the inoculation of an animal,—the horse being in the present case the chosen one. Repeated inoculations are made at given intervals until the animal no longer reacts to the effects of a progressively increasing dose. Then the condition of so-called "immunity" is reached, which consists in the impossibility of making the subject of the experiment sick by any amount of similar poison that can be introduced into his circulation. The watery element of the blood of the animal is then used for the human patient, who, through its protective power, is in turn rendered "immune," or, in other words, is guaranteed against the poisonous influences of the disease. The horse does not suffer; and the human patient is in the end saved. The same may be said of many other experiments so absurdly combated by the anti-vivisectionists. In diphtheria the knowledge of its cause brings a promised means for its cure. Making every allowance for exaggeration of good results in the treatment of this dreadful disease, there is certainly enough of truth in the statements of enthusiastic advocates of the new method to warrant the hope that the same principle may be applied to other infectious diseases, and with like benefit.

It seems fair to conclude, from our present knowledge of the subject, that acute ailments are the only ones in which the serum treatment has a rational hold. Pulmonary consumption, which has now, rather prematurely, perhaps, assumed a position in the contagious class, is essentially of such a chronic nature and attended with such radical organic changes, that there does not appear to be much chance of altering the fundamental morbific condition by actively increasing any of the purely resisting tendencies of the blood itself. This is claimed to have been the mistake in the lymph treatment. Far from mitigating the disease, it appeared to favor the extension. It was a valuable though dangerous means for diagnosis, and has been very properly relegated to such use in cattle.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The more practical application of the microbic theory has been in the direction of preventing the spread of infection. From such a standpoint science has had its greatest and most lasting triumphs. The reason for the spread of many of the common epidemics is no longer a mystery. It is now explained satisfactorily by a direct or indirect transfer of micro-organisms from one human body to another. A good illustration of the way in which this is done is that afforded by the spread of typhoid fever. In this disease there is of course a special germ, called the typhoid bacillus. Having been discovered in the discharges of the patient, and also in drinking water, it was not difficult to reconcile associated conditions. The contamination of the water supply by the sick patient was a theory easily substantiated. The origin of every epidemic was traced accordingly; and there was no end of corroborative testimony. Now, when typhoid breaks out in any locality, the first thing done is the examination of the drinking water for bacilli. When the latter are discovered, the sources of typhoid are cut off and the epidemic is immediately checked. Certainly nothing could be more satisfactory in the whole category of prevention. Other and indirect methods by which the bacillus may enter the system are illustrated in the infection of the oyster from contaminated streams, and in the thousand and one ways in which milk and other foods may be fever-poisoned through the agencies of the utensils, hands, or clothing of the patient. The same may be said regarding the like causes of the invasion of cholera, and with a similar comforting assurance of the knowledge of the means for the prevention of epidemics of that disease. Diphtheria is more liable to spread as the result of actual contact with the poison than most other infectious diseases. Thus, by unadvisedly kissing the sick one, using the same spoon, or by being exposed to the exhalation or expectoration of the patient during operations upon the throat, many lives have been lost which by ordinary precautions might have been saved.

With pulmonary consumption the dust of the dried expectoration is believed to be the direct medium of infection. Considering the widespread dissemination of that material in crowded cities, and the thousands who breathe bacilli everywhere they go,—in street cars, sleeping-berths, hotels, parlors, and churches,—and taking into account the alarming bulletins of ambitiously active Health Boards, it would appear that the disease should be well-nigh universal. It is a satisfaction, however, to know that the chances of infection with a healthy person are so exceedingly small as not to merit mention, much less

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause alarm. With every communicable disease it is a question of seed taking good root in the properly prepared soil. Especially is this the case with phthisis. The degree of vital resistance is the real element of protection. When there is no preparation of the soil by hereditary predisposition or lowered health standard, the individual is amply guarded against attack. Otherwise no one would be safe anywhere. The real good that may come from the agitation of the question of contagion in this disease is the opportunity afforded Health Boards of educating the victims to the necessary habits of cleanliness, which in individual cases will lessen the possibilities of disseminating the germs. If the ultimate result shall be nothing more than the abolition of the abominable habit of promiscuous spitting in public conveyances and assembly rooms, the present senseless scare may yet eventuate in the greatest benefit to the majority. The enforcement of regulations to such an end very properly belongs to the various Health Boards; but when the latter attempt to assume control of the patient, separate him from his family, forcibly confine him in a municipal sanitarium, and direct medical treatment by governmental authority, they exceed their legitimate functions and magnify the importance of so-called duties out of all proportion to the real necessity for their performance. It is proper, however, to say in this connection that Health Bureaus as such have very important relations to the public, and are very properly the legitimate agents for the enforcement of the general sanitary regulations of towns and cities. In fact, the establishment of these boards for such purposes is one of the most convincing evidences of the advance of medicine in the widest application of its benefits to the needs of the greatest number.

In noting in a general way the beneficial influences of progressive medicine, I may refer, in passing, to a few matters of detail which may not be uninteresting to the general reader.

There is a little history connected with the discovery of intubation, which carries with it a useful moral. Nearly half a century ago Bouchut, a distinguished French physician, startled the savants of that period by the announcement that it was much better to introduce a tube in the windpipe of a suffocating child than to trust to the chances of obtaining air for the sufferer by a cut in the throat. The prejudices of his colleagues were too strong for him to resist, and, being forced to abandon his idea, he lost the opportunity of putting it to the practical test. From that time until O'Dwyer of New York popularized the method, and became the means of saving hundreds of precious lives

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by what is now known as the intubation method, humanity was deprived of one of its greatest boons.

The belief at one time that extracts of different organs of animals could be used for the treatment of disease of corresponding organs in man, has not been confirmed by more recent experimentation. Brown-Séquard's so-styled "Elixir of Life" followed its inventor to a common grave; and the disease of old age, to which all mankind is liable, is still considered incurable. A curious exception, however, to the efficacy of gland treatment has been shown in the cure of the newly-described disease, myxœdema, by the use of an extract of the thyroid. This was discovered by a somewhat novel yet strictly logical method of reasoning. It had long been known that, after complete extirpation of the thyroid gland for goitrous swelling, patients developed a peculiar condition of mal-nutrition which was manifested by a fleshy puffing of the face and hands, wasting of the nails, and a progressive physical and mental weakness. The absence of the gland being naturally associated with these phenomena, it was then advised that a portion of the goitrous swelling be left behind after an operation. The result was so satisfactory in preventing the occurrence of bad symptoms that a rule was established accordingly. In the cases in which the gland had been entirely removed, an attempt was made to supply the deficiency by feeding the patient with the raw or stewed thyroid of the sheep. The result was also very promising. Then another fact presented itself; viz., that myxœdema, a disease with essentially the same symptoms, was associated with marked deficiency of thyroid development. This gave the proper indication for a similar method of treatment, which, to say the least, has been surprisingly successful.

What promises to be a great service in enabling physicians to more surely recognize typhoid fever in its earliest stages, is the peculiar reaction of the blood of the suspected patient with a culture of the typhoid bacillus. This was first brought to the notice of the profession by Widal; and the method rightly bears his name. If the case be one of typhoid fever, a drop of the patient's blood will kill the bacilli of a culture with which it is brought into contact; but if the bacilli are not affected, the patient has not the disease. The theory of the phenomenon is that the poison of typhoid in the blood of the patient is sufficiently strong and active to destroy even at that early period the typhoid bacilli from another source. Here, too, is a principle which may have a wide application to diagnosis under similar conditions with still other diseases.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The great improvement in the present as compared with the past methods of administering medicines deserves a passing comment. Scarcely a generation ago the threat of a dose of the nauseous drugs of the day was sufficient to suppress the worst of evil propensities in the most wicked boy. When actually in need of medication, he was held in the chair and gagged to exhaustion in the parental anxiety to measure the capacity of his unwilling stomach with the bulky contents of the justly hated bottle. Frequently the struggle had more to do with the perspiration than the medicine. Very often, for obvious reasons, the bottle broke before the fever. Castor oil was a punishment, rhubarb was a terror, and senna an abomination. The nauseous mixtures of our grandparents are now replaced by the elegant and almost tasty compounds of modern pharmacy. The essentials of the former medicines are now given in the forms of condensed extracts and alkaloids in proportionately reduced bulk, and in consistently concentrated form. Single remedies with special indications take the place of the old-fashioned shot-gun mixtures. Tablets, pellets, and pills no longer offend the palate; and even quinine, the bitterest enemy of taste, now sues for favor in sugar-coated armor. The irritable stomach which denies the usual approach to the internal economy is now diplomatically checkmated by an injection under the skin, which, although a longer way round, is a surer way home.

In the adaptation of different climates to the cure of various chronic diseases, a new science of therapeutics has been created. The study of the temperature range, barometric pressure, and rainfall of different localities has been as faithfully carried on and with as careful reference to the needs of the invalid as the composition and strength of the various medicines composing his other prescriptions. Oftentimes change of air and scene is the only treatment indicated. It is the proper fitting of the patient to a new and necessary environment which makes the difference between an agreeable and helpful life in another country as compared with growing discontent and protracted suffering at home.

The vital resistance to disease, which must exist in every individual, has received new attention and study in consideration of the plausibility of the theory of Metchnikoff. This talented and indefatigable observer maintained that the white corpuscles of the blood had a peculiar power of destroying disease germs which so constantly found their way into the circulating fluid. In fact, with his microscope, he noted the manner in which the germs became devoured in the substance of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disks in question. Interesting and confirmatory experiments in the same direction were made in artificially produced areas of inflammation in the lower animals. Although the conclusions are not universally admitted, there is enough in the fundamental idea, and its adaptability to the present well-recognized conditions of general protection against disease, to warrant the further study which it is now receiving from other laboratory workers. Already we are learning that the watery portions of the blood have also a bactericidal property, and that the increase of the latter by anti-toxins may be an explanation of the good results of that class of remedies.

In attempting a general review of the progress of medicine in keeping with the purpose of this article, it is impossible to do more than refer in a casual way to some of the leading points of departure from the older methods to the newer and better ones. There are enough of these to give the best of assurances of good work already done and of promises for rapid advancement in the future. Medicine has kept its pace with the other sciences, slowly, perhaps, but surely. The days of supposed miracles have passed. Faith in the marvellous has given place to work in the actual. The greatest miracle of all is creation itself, upon which all science is founded. It is by the sweat of the brow that the best discoveries can be made. In these days of quackery and pretentious faith-cures it is a comfort for such as believe in honest effort to know that the pay for the same is in some solid good, some real advance, some lasting benefit. The history of medical discovery shows that nothing permanently useful was ever obtained by mere accident or by avowed inspiration. Belief in the faith-cure may be calculated for spiritual strength, but not for physical regeneration. The only miracle of the laying on of healing hands, of blessing handkerchiefs, and the like rests in the possibility of the ridiculous belief in such methods. As well might we expect that mere faith would set a broken limb, or start a silent clock. The same may be said of every other species of quackery. Scientific medicine is at least sincere, even if it cannot actually promise as much as it might wish. What it has, however, is truth and fact; consequently, her honest influences are felt in every direction in which the betterment of the race is possible. The lesson of the hour has its widest possible application in the preservation of health, the prevention of disease, and the cure of the sick. It is the faith, hope, and charity of the medical ideal.

The natural state of man should be that of health from the beginning to the end of the life-chapter. Disease is an incident of his want of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adaptability to his environment. His real health needs are simple enough, and apply to necessary clothing, sufficient food, and suitable shelter. All outside this is payment on the mortgage of luxury. Some one has said, "When men were made of oak they lived in houses of willow, and when the sacramental wine was drunk from chalices of wood, Christianity was golden; but when the troth was pledged in cups of gold, the faith was wooden." It was the survival of the fittest in the race for the really good and essential in life. Now we have the struggle with the weak and unfit to match them with the much-coveted requirements of the unnecessary. Civilization, with all its benefits in the elevation of mankind to the higher sphere of its destined usefulness, has brought with it the penalties for abuses and excesses. Medical science strives to adjust the balance between the punishment and the crime. So far it has worked valiantly, consistently, and hopefully. The fundamental laws of health are now better understood than formerly; the prevention of disease has become a law of necessity; and the assuagement of human suffering has risen to the level of a high art. The dangers of excesses are appreciated and avoided; bad habits are condemned; and the more helpful enforcement of sanitary laws is an accomplished fact. With the more extended application of the principles of hygiene large populations can live safely together; and even the vices of communities are counteracted by the indignant protests of educated public opinion. In forty-one States of the Union every young scholar educated by the public must learn that rum as a luxury is also a poison; that temperance in all things is nature's standard; that all excesses are more than counterbalanced by consequent depression; and that, most of all, the human body is the perfection of creation, the gift of a God with the ever-present responsibility of its safe and reverent keeping.

The history of the past is the best prediction for the future. In the light of recent events, we have no right to assume that there is any disease incurable to-day which may not in a near to-morrow be triumphantly vanquished by its remedy. Surely nothing should hinder the army of conscientious, arduous, and patient toilers whose greatest gratification is in the infatuation of the work itself, and whose higher aim is the saving of the lives of their fellow men.

GEORGE F. SHRADY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TORREY BANKRUPT BILL.

THE Federal Constitution provides (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 4) as follows: "The Congress shall have power . . . to establish . . . uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States." It also provides (Art. 1, Sec. 10, Clause 1) that "No State shall . . . pass any . . . law impairing the obligation of contracts."

Under the power conferred as above upon Congress, laws were enacted in 1800, 1841, and 1867. The first two were of short duration; but the last was in force eleven years.

The law of 1867, for various reasons, was unsatisfactory to the people in all parts of the country. It contained provisions, not properly a part of a bankruptcy law, which brought it unnecessarily in conflict with State laws; and the fees exacted by it for the performance of official services were exorbitant, and were so paid that the officers receiving them were interested in delaying the administration of estates. An additional reason why the law became unpopular was that it did not apply alike to all our citizens; being limited in its operations to a class known under the general designation of "traders." The people do not like favoritism or caste of any kind: they desire that the laws shall apply equally to all. Prior to 1861, the bankruptcy law in England was limited to "traders"; but since then it has been applicable to all classes of citizens.

Shortly after the repeal in 1878 of the last law, it became apparent to the business men of the country that it should have been amended, and not repealed. They realized that the honest, unfortunate debtor who meets with financial misfortune should have a comprehensive discharge as contemplated by the Constitution; but this they knew he could not secure under any law which a State could pass. When the only recourse of creditors was to proceed individually against a common debtor,—as provided under State laws,—it frequently resulted in the debtor being financially ruined through undue selfish haste; and generally the result was the inequitable distribution of the estate, at a very large expense, between creditors of equal rights. They knew that under a wise bankruptcy law honest insolvent debtors

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be discharged; that creditors would proceed collectively against a common debtor; and that, in the event of his being declared a bankrupt, the estate would be ratably divided between the creditors of equal rights, in accordance with the rules of equity.

This feeling of regret at the repeal of the old law, and the realization of the necessity for a new one, resulted in a national convention being held at Washington in 1881. A second convention was held in the same city in 1884; a third was held in St. Louis in the spring of 1889; and a fourth at Minneapolis in the fall of the same year. At the last three of these, I had the honor of presiding as permanent president.

The Lowell bill was approved by the first two of the conventions; and at the third convention a bill was drafted and presented by me, and was referred, together with the Lowell bill, to a committee composed of leading members of that body. The committee reported my bill favorably, and sent it broadcast over the country; inviting suggestions as to amendments. It was then considered at the Minneapolis convention for two days, and was finally approved unanimously. A resolution, introduced by Hon. John J. Hornor, a delegate from Fort Smith, Arkansas, providing that the bill should be named "The Torrey Bankrupt Bill," was also adopted.

It should be borne in mind that these conventions were not composed of representatives of great mercantile corporations,—as has been untruthfully alleged,—but of representatives of commercial, industrial, and professional bodies, the members of which were debtors and creditors in all parts of the country. Their object was not to secure the enactment of a purely voluntary or an involuntary law, but to formulate a law that should be at once voluntary and involuntary, equitable and comprehensive in its scope, and that should fully protect the rights of all classes. The bill solves the problem of bankruptcy legislation, it is confidently believed; for it has been very generally endorsed by business and industrial bodies in all parts of the country.

The Executive Committee of the convention at Minneapolis was authorized to amend the bill from time to time as I might recommend; and, pursuant to that authority, it has been amended as seemed best in the course of my studies upon the subject, or as has appeared desirable from suggestions of Members of Congress, from correspondence with insolvent debtors, members of the bench and bar, and debtors and creditors in all parts of the country. There have been successive editions of the bill, each rendered more perfect by amendment than the preced-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing one; but the framework, the objects, and the means of attaining them have never been changed.

In the Fifty-first, as also in the Fifty-fourth, Congress the bill was passed by the House; but in the Fifty-third Congress it was defeated in the House. The voluntary bill of Mr. Bailey was passed by that body, but was not voted upon in the Senate. There are also a number of bills pending in Congress in imitation of the voluntary measure introduced and championed by Hon. Joseph W. Bailey, a Member from Texas; but there has been no attempt on the part of any Member of Congress to draft a voluntary and involuntary measure; for the Torrey Bill, by the common consent of those who favor a complete law, meets all the requirements of the Constitution.

In countries where there is but one legislative body, a bankruptcy law would not be materially affected by its containing provisions which properly belonged to other laws; but in this country it is different. Here we have forty-five States, all having supreme legislative power, except to the extent to which it was surrendered to Congress by the Constitution. I remember that, in drafting the bill, I inserted in it provisions upon all subjects for which I found a precedent in other laws; and after completing it in that form, I spent two weeks in simply eliminating provisions which, in my judgment, were not properly a part of such a law. The scope then given to the bill has never been changed.

The bill is limited to such provisions as are necessary to make it comprehensively guard the rights of both debtors and creditors. Being national in character, it must, of course, be enforced in the national courts; it having been repeatedly decided that Congress has no right to require State courts to enforce national laws.

The essential features of the Torrey Bankrupt Bill are as follows:

Every person and firm owing debts may become a voluntary bankrupt. Corporations cannot go voluntarily into bankruptcy; but they may be adjudged bankrupts in proceedings against them by their creditors on the ground that they have committed an act of bankruptcy. In general terms an act of bankruptcy is an act for the commission of which by a debtor in most of the States an attachment would be justified; such as indicates insolvency and inability to prevent his property from being inequitably divided among his creditors while insolvent; or of protracted default in payments due while insolvent.

Since proceedings, when instituted, are for the benefit of all the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creditors, it is provided that a petition cannot be filed except by three of them collectively holding unsecured claims of at least $500.

When a petition shall have been filed against a defendant alleging that he has committed an act of bankruptcy, he will be served with process as in ordinary suits; and if he, or any of his creditors not joining in the petition, deny the allegations of the petition, there will be a trial as in other cases. The defendant may, if he desires, have a trial by jury. An appeal may be taken from an adjudication of bankruptcy.

After the filing of the petition, and prior to the trial, the property rights of the defendant will not be interfered with in any respect unless the creditors shall file affidavits showing to the satisfaction of the court the commission of an act of bankruptcy by the defendant, as set forth in the petition, and shall apply for an order for taking possession of the property of the defendant. Before such order will be executed, the plaintiffs must give bond to the defendant to indemnify him in the event of such order proving to have been wrongfully obtained. Even then the defendant may give a forthcoming bond and retain the possession of the property. These provisions place the defendant in a bankruptcy suit upon the same footing as defendants in other suits. Such was not the case, however, under the old bankruptcy law; and in consequence a great many hardships arose. For example, while the property might be left in the possession of the defendant, still, on his being adjudged a bankrupt, the title of the trustee dated back to the date of the filing of the petition and resulted in setting aside any conveyance of property which the bankrupt might have made during the proceedings.

After the adjudication that a defendant is a bankrupt, the rights and responsibilities of both the bankrupt and the creditors are the same, whether the case be a voluntary or involuntary one.

The bill encourages compositions between debtors and their creditors, and provides that they may be made after the filing of the petition and either before or after the adjudication. In order to prevent the debtor from imposing on his creditors, it is required that he shall be examined in open court, and shall file a list of his creditors and a schedule of his property. A compliance with these requirements will enable the creditors to judge of both the honesty of the debtor and the value of their claims. His proposed composition must be accepted by a majority in number of his creditors, who represent a majority in amount of the claims against his estate. He must also deposit in court, or subject to the order of the judge, whatever he proposes to pay or give to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his creditors as a consideration for the composition; so that, if the composition shall be confirmed by the judge, the amount of the consideration may be delivered direct to the creditors. After, but not before, the foregoing provisions have been complied with, his offer may be filed in the bankruptcy court. These provisions are inserted in order to preclude the possibility of creditors being trifled with by the debtor. The creditors will all be notified of the hearing of the proposed composition; and each creditor may favor or oppose it. The judge will confirm only such compositions as are for the best interests of the creditors. A composition which has been fraudulently obtained may be set aside.

Assistant judicial officers, called "referees," may be appointed by the bankruptcy courts in such numbers as shall prove necessary for the convenience of the people, and to enable the courts to dispose of bankruptcy business expeditiously. It is contemplated that at least one such officer shall be appointed for each county; and in larger counties a greater number. These officers will receive a $10 filing fee for each case, 1 per cent on the amount paid in dividends by estates administered before them, and half that amount in cases in which there is a composition. In every case both fee and commission will be withheld until the estate has been administered and closed.

Trustees will be appointed by and represent the creditors. There may be one or three for each estate, as may be determined by the creditors. They will receive a filing fee of $5 in each case, and 5 per cent on the first $5,000 paid to the creditors as dividends; 2 per cent on the second $5,000 so paid; and 1 per cent on amounts in excess of $10,000. Neither fee nor commission will be paid until the estate has been closed.

The fact that the commissions paid to the foregoing officers are upon net results will interest those officers financially in administering the estates as economically as possible. The expenses of administering estates will be limited to those which are necessary and actual; and they will not be paid until after being reported under oath and passed upon by the judge. Moreover, since all compensation is withheld until the estates are closed, those officers will have a pecuniary interest in closing them as quickly as possible.

Litigation as to property rights will be conducted in the courts which would have had jurisdiction of such litigation if bankruptcy had not occurred.

Liens which may have been obtained by proceedings at law or in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equity, commenced within four months prior to the filing of the petition, will be set aside. Liens which were given for a present consideration and in good faith, and not in contemplation of bankruptcy, will be upheld.

The transfer of property or the payment of money by a debtor to a creditor within four months prior to the filing of the petition in bankruptcy against such debtor, for the purpose of defeating the operation of the law, or of enabling such creditor to obtain a greater percentage of his claim than any other creditor of the same class, will be deemed a preference, and may be set aside at the instance of the trustee of the estate of such debtor if he shall become a bankrupt. Money paid or property transferred to a lawyer in excess of a reasonable amount for services may be recovered.

The bankrupt may apply for a discharge subsequent to the expiration of two months after the adjudication and within the next four months. If, for reasons over which he has no control, he should be prevented from making the application within that time, the judge may permit him to file it within the next six months; but not afterward. The discharge will not be granted if the defendant has been guilty of any of the offences enumerated in the act; *e. g.*, of having given a preference within six months prior to the filing of the petition, which has not been surrendered; obtained upon credit, on a materially false statement in writing made by him to the person from whom the property was obtained, or to a mercantile agency, any property not paid for or restored at the time the petition was filed; made a transfer of his property which might be impeached by a creditor; or, with fraudulent intent, destroyed or neglected to keep books of account. The discharge, if fraudulently obtained, may be set aside upon application of creditors. The granting of a discharge will not release the defendant from debts which are due as taxes; which have been reduced to judgments in actions for frauds or wilful and malicious injury to the person or property of another; which have not been duly scheduled, unless the creditor had knowledge of the proceedings in bankruptcy; or were created by fraud, embezzlement, or defalcation while acting as an officer or serving in any fiduciary capacity.

Exemptions will be allowed as provided, at the time the petition was filed, by the laws of the State in which the bankrupt resides.

Suitable provisions are made for the punishment of bankrupts, creditors, and officers who have violated the provisions of the law.

Under the old law a number of the judges secured for their relatives

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desirable appointments. The Torrey Bill provides that no persons who are related by consanguinity or affinity within the third degree, as determined by the common law, to either of the judges of the United States courts in any district shall be appointed referees in such district.

The proof and allowance of claims will be a simple and inexpensive matter. If it be suspected that a claim is fraudulent, it may be suspended and examined.

All money belonging to estates must be deposited in a designated depository, and will not be paid out except upon the check or draft of the trustee.

The bill, in addition to the foregoing, contains such provisions as are necessary to make it comprehensive of the rights of unfortunate and dishonest debtors and their creditors.

The vote in the Fifty-fourth Congress in the House of Representatives, by which the bill was passed by the large majority of seventy-six,—after a five-day debate in which it was championed by Gen. D. B. Henderson of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary,—may be summarized as follows:—

	Yea.	Nay.	Not Voting.
Eastern States	18	0	8
Middle "	49	4	27
Southern "	28	39	37
Western "	55	33	40
Pacific "	7	5	4
Totals	157	81	116

It will be noted that in the Eastern, Middle, Western, and Pacific States, the bill received a majority in its favor; while the majority against it in the Southern States was only eleven. Most of the one hundred and sixteen members not voting were paired; the presumption being that one-half of them were for and the other one-half against the bill. The Texas delegation in the House gave eight votes in favor of the bill, and only two against it; while three did not vote. In the Fifty-first Congress only one Member from that State, as I remember, voted with our friends. This change speaks volumes for the merits of the bill. Indeed it constitutes a great victory; considering the fact that Mr. Bailey, a Member from that State, greatly distinguished himself as leader of the opposition and in advocacy of his bill for purely voluntary bankruptcy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The chief opposition to the enactment of the measure is by a few great houses in different parts of the country, which have so perfected their credit and collection departments that, under present laws, they can legally take advantage of their unfortunate debtors and of all associate creditors not equally well equipped with themselves. These great houses do not want passed a bankruptcy law which will transfer from their private offices to the court-house the throne to which their unfortunate debtors must appeal for relief. They do not want their appropriation of the debtors' assets, to the full extent of their claims, in spite of the equal rights of other creditors, interfered with by a court of justice. To them the constitutional right of debtors and equity among creditors, when in derogation of their financial interests, are not to be encouraged; and hence they are violently opposed to the passage of the bill.

The fate of the bill in the Senate is problematical. The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate acted upon the subject before the Torrey Bill was passed by the House. The majority reported a bill which had been introduced by Senator George of Mississippi, and amended by the Committee. A minority reported the Torrey Bill, and when it was referred by the Senate—as passed by the House—to its Committee on the Judiciary, all of it was stricken out after the enacting clause, and the bill of Senator George substituted in its stead. These bills are now upon the calendar of the Senate; and it is to be hoped that they will be considered and acted upon during the present session.

If, in the meantime, the friends of the Torrey Bill throughout the country shall make their wishes known to the members of the Senate, the result of the House will be more than duplicated in the Senate; and, as a result, the constitutional rights which are now dormant will be available to the people.

 JAY L. TORREY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN EXCAVATIONS IN GREECE.—II.

THE discoveries of the theatres of Assos, Thorikos, and Sicyon, as set forth in the preceding article, supplied valuable data for the elucidation of several unsolved questions relating to the theatre of the Greeks. And as the origin of the Greek drama is closely bound up with the worship of Dionysos, it was a judicious choice which determined the next venture of the American School. For Ikaria was reputed to have been the first abode in Attica of the god Dionysos, the birthplace of Thespis, and the original home of Greek drama.

As in the case of other ancient demes of Attica, the precise locality of Ikaria had long been the subject of controversy among geographers and travellers in Greece. These conjectures and arguments, quoted by the late Prof. Merriam at length, are typical of antiquarian controversies based upon mere theory and assumption; but they are usually disposed of in the end by demonstrations which are as simple as they are indisputable.

In the spring of 1887, Prof. Milchhöffer undertook an exploring journey through Attica, preparative of the text accompanying the monumental "Karten von Attika" of the German staff. In his search for inscriptions of topographical interest, he found rich materials imbedded in the walls of ruined chapels, built up of ancient fragments. He thus succeeded in determining with certainty the locality of several ancient demes. On May 9, returning from Marathon to Kephisia, he took the unusual route by the valley of Rapedosa along the north-eastern declivity of Mount Pentelicus, and soon found himself in one of the most lovely and secluded spots in Attica. Here, in a thick wood, is a spot known to this day as "Dionysos"; and in a grove of pines and ivy, such as the service of the god would have demanded, are the ruins of a small, but remarkable, Byzantine church. Some fragments of beautifully ornamented Byzantine slabs show that a still earlier and probably larger church stood here. The tolerably well preserved walls of the ruin, about six feet high, are built almost entirely of large blocks of Pentelic marble, evidently taken from an ancient structure, and include the jambs and supports of doors. Other fragments are strewn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about. To form the apse of the church a semicircular choragic monument had been utilized, the architrave of which, apparently discarded in the process, and lying near, bore an inscription which has been published by Chandler. Among the ruins Milchhöffer now discovered another inscription, infinitely more important, since it recorded a dedication to Dionysos by "Kephisos, son of Timarchos of Ikaria." This, coupled with the modern name of the place, left no doubt in his mind that he had hit upon the much-debated locality of Ikaria; and he announced his discovery in the "Berliner philologische Wochenschrift" of June 18, 1887.

A hundred and twenty years earlier, Chandler, while journeying from Athens to Marathon, had been attracted to this very spot by information as to the existence of the above-mentioned inscription; and he then wrote:—

"We penetrated into a lonely recess and came to a small ruined church of St. Dionysius, standing on the marble heap of a trophy or monument, erected for some victory obtained by three persons named Ænias, Xanthippus, and Xanthicles. The inscription is on a long stone lying near." ("Travels in Greece," p. 160.)

Chandler, nevertheless, did not suspect how narrowly he had missed the elucidation of one of the most contested points in Attic topography. Some eight years before Chandler, Stuart had drawn up, while in Athens, a list of "Modern names of towns, villages, monasteries, and farms, with their ancient names," which he prefixed to the third volume of his "Antiquities of Athens." In it he writes: "Dionys (modern) = Dionysia (ancient), between Stamati and Cephisia. A *metoche* [pendant] of Cyriani [*sic*, *i. e.*, Kæsariané] on the foot of Pentelicus near Stamati." He further quotes a passage from Suidas anent the Athenian festival of Dionysia, which Stuart evidently associated in his mind with the name of the place. But he also did not suspect its identity with ancient Ikaria; for the spot is not marked on his map. It figures for the first time on the map of Greece published by the French staff shortly after the establishment of the kingdom; and to this fact F. Lenormant refers ("Recherches archéol. à Eleusis," 1862, p. 243) when he goes on to say that, on the road from Rapedosa to Stamata,

"one meets the ruins of a small mediæval monastery to which the peasants of the mountain give to this day the name of 'Dionyso.' This monastery, which is mentioned by none of the learned who have treated of the geography of Attica, is shown only on the fine map of the French staff. The name it has preserved to the present time is undoubtedly connected with the ancient tradition which recorded the sojourn of Bacchus in that district."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lenormant, who also did not dream how near Ikaria he had been, does not mention the fact,—apparently known to few archæologists, although of great service in the identification of classic localities,—that in Greece churches erected on the sites of ancient temples were almost invariably dedicated to the saint whose attributes in Christian hagiography corresponded to the character of the divinity the worship of which Christianity had there supplanted, or whose name recalled that of the heathen god there formerly honored. In the present case, as Chandler clearly states, the small ruined church was dedicated to St. Dionysius, the Areopagite.

The summer resort of Kephisia, on the western extremity of Mount Pentelicus, is forty-five minutes by rail from Athens. Thence a stiff walk of an hour, through groves of pines and masses of arbutus and oleander, brings the traveller in view of the snow-clad Dirphys and the chain of mountains beyond—a continuous sweep of alpine grandeur that makes one forget all weariness of body in the exaltation of the moment. After a further walk of more than an hour one enters the "lonely recess," shaded by majestic plane-trees, which thrive on the perennial stream that flows in the glen close by. "The scenery," adds Prof. Merriam, "is in harmony with the twofold side of the worship of Dionysos, the gay and joyous, the sad and mournful, and is aptly fitted to inspire a Susarion and a Thespis. The spot is full of Theocritean dignity and simplicity." The region thus described is some twelve hundred feet above the sea; and, although the vine is not now cultivated there, the careful terracing of the ground below points to the existence in days gone by of a widespread viniculture, with which the cult of Dionysos and the legend of Ikarios are intimately connected.

Put in a few words, this legend personifies the heroic type of the Athenian farmer in Ikaria, who is visited by the god and is taught the culture of the vine and the art of wine-making. Ikarios then offers to Dionysos a goat that had injured the vine; and his inflated skin is tossed about in the sports and dances which the joys of wine-drinking provoke. Travelling through the country, Ikarios next proclaims the new cult, and offers far and wide the unmixed gift of the god. But the friends of the shepherds who had drunk themselves into a stupor, thinking Ikarios had poisoned them, kill him, only to lament the crime when the supposed victims begin to grow sober. Erigone, the daughter of Ikarios, overpowered with grief at her father's death, hangs herself by his tomb. Ikarios is now revered as the eponymous hero and mythical king of the township, the mournful dirge of the "Linos"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being chanted in his honor; while the woes of Erigone are recited in a deeply plaintive song called "Aletis." Thus, the rural festival of the Dionysia, held yearly on the completion of the vintage, is instituted. The rough dances and mummeries gradually ripen into plays enacted by buffoons; and Ikaria becomes celebrated for her choruses and choreographic representations. Attracted here from Megara, Susarion upraised these rude performances by an infusion of the comic talent of the Megarians, and thus created comedy; while Thespis, a native of Ikaria, inspired by the mournful side of the legend, elaborated the tragic form of the drama. This origin of the two great branches of dramatic art is indicated in the words of Athenæus (ii. 40): "From strong-drinking came the invention of tragedy and comedy in the Attic Ikaria at the very time of vintage." Thenceforward Thespis was honored as the father of the Attic theatre; and dramatic art, the great invention of the Ikarians,—being the outgrowth of their worship of Dionysos,—became part of the service paid to the god throughout Greece. In Athens, especially, the great Dionysia were celebrated with much pomp; scenes from the Ikarian legend were represented in the reliefs of the Dionysiac theatre; and the priest of the god occupied there the seat of honor.

This short account makes manifest the interest attaching to the site of Ikaria, and also the importance of ascertaining all that the spot itself could reveal in connection with the early growth of the drama. It was an enviable task which thus fell to the lot of the American School; and it was prosecuted with zeal and signal success. Never has an exploration yielded more readily or more abundantly results of such importance, with so small an outlay of money or labor. "The work," we are told, "has been like the opening of a great chest of hidden and forgotten treasures." The site was the property of Mr. A. Heliopoulos, British Vice-Consul at Aivali, in Asia Minor; permission to excavate was readily granted; and on January 30, 1888, Mr. C. D. Buck, of Yale, taking a hammock and some provisions, established himself in an untenanted and the only house in the valley, and, with but half a dozen workmen at first, continued operations up to March 19. The exploration was resumed on November 13, and was brought to a close in the second week of the following January.

The first step was to take down the walls of the ruined church, which at once yielded a mass of fragments of reliefs, statues, inscriptions, architraves, and other architectural pieces. From among these were recovered the wall-blocks and flat roof-pieces belonging to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

semicircular choragic monument, referred to by Chandler, of which only two courses were still standing. It was thus possible to arrive at an approximately accurate reconstruction of the whole, with the exception of the ornamentation of the roof, which possibly supported a tripod. The inscribed architrave, long known to exist, was found exactly where Chandler had seen it, the thick vegetation around having shielded it from harm; and the American explorers were now enabled to correct Chandler's inaccurate reading of "Ænias" instead of "Hagnias"—the name of one of the three choregi, the patrons of the chorus, who had erected the monument to commemorate their triumph in a tragic competition held in honor of Dionysos. In size the monument would be about two-thirds that of Lysikrates at Athens, if the circle were complete.

As the clearing of the site of the church and of its immediate proximity progressed, the most complete evidence, both artistic and epigraphic, accumulated; placing beyond all doubt the location of Ikaria, and proving it to have remained for many centuries the centre of an active cult of Dionysos. Among the earliest finds were two inscriptions with decrees of the township of Ikaria, the following being a translation of the more important of the two:—

"Callippos was the mover. Voted by the Ikarians to commend and to crown Nikon the town clerk (*demarikos*); and that the crier shall publicly proclaim that the Ikarians and the township of the Ikarians do crown Nikon with a crown of ivy, for that right well and duly he hath ordered the festival of Dionysos and the competition. Voted also to commend the patrons of the chorus Epikrates and Praxias, and to crown them with a crown of ivy, and further that the crier shall make the same proclamation in regard to them that was ordered for the town clerk."

The orthography of this inscription indicates that the decree is not later than the third, and may be as early as the fourth, century B.C. Two other inscriptions, engraved on boundary stones, were found near the church: the one partaking of the character of a bill of sale; the other having reference to a dowry and to a mortgage involved in its payment. A third contains details of the production of plays. In one of the dedicatory inscriptions of the fourth century occurs the name of the poet whose play was victorious—Nikostratos, whom we know as the younger son of Aristophanes. Aristophanes himself refers, in the "Knights," v. 519, to the many victories of the comic poet Magnes, who had not then (424 B.C.) been long dead. He flourished about a century after Thespis, and was, next to him, the most renowned of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ikarian dramatists. In all, some twenty inscriptions were here discovered; many of them choragic and of the first importance. Rarely, if ever, has a site been identified so conclusively by means of inscriptions. Ikaria, when not treated as half mythical, was for centuries driven from pillar to post through the length and breadth of Attica; but it has now been located with greater certainty and distinctness than any other of the Attic rural districts.

Besides the choragic monument, a large quantity of architectural remains were found, including altars, pedestals, and bases,—many of these in the course of trial trenches dug across the site. By this means were unearthed, also, the foundations of several structures the purpose of which is not clear. Among these, traces of a theatre, properly so called, were not met with; except indeed a rude wall, curved at the extremities and facing a row of five massive marble seats, as if intended to enclose an orchestra, or dancing-ground for theatrical representations. The slopes of the hill, rising behind the marble seats, which were no doubt those of the priests and magistrates, would have afforded excellent seating for the rural population, who thence would have had a good view of the orchestra, with, perhaps, a wooden stage erected for the occasion; and the prospect of the plain of Marathon and the sea beyond supplied the sort of scenic arrangement the Greeks loved so dearly. No temple of Dionysos was found; but the numerous votive offerings and inscriptions recovered, as well as the architectural fragments of which the Byzantine church was built, leave no reasonable doubt that the latter replaced a demolished sanctuary of the god. Two of the inscriptions found—both of the fifth century—are of especial interest in regard to the rural worship of Dionysos. They speak of the money of the god, state the amount in hand, and make provision for the erection and repair of "the statue."

Portions of this statue are believed to have been traced among the fragments of statuary found mostly within and around the church. Beneath the wall, to the north, part of a colossal head or mask of the bearded Dionysos, of the finest archaic art, was discovered; and, deeper in the soil, a large fragment of the beard, as well as one of the large curls, each an inch and a half across, in which the hair over the forehead is arranged. These curls are partly fashioned separately and fitted into holes, and partly cut out of the block of marble. Similar holes appear above the row of curls where a garland was attached; and of this some bronze leaves were found. The rest of the hair, as well as the mustache and beard, is treated in a peculiar wavy fashion. Beneath

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the floor of the church was next found a colossal archaic seated torso, preserved from neck to thigh. A socket in the neck marks the place where the head, presumably the one just described, was fitted in. The sandaled feet were next met with, imbedded in the wall to the right; and, in other parts of the ruin, the right hand, a portion of the right leg, and a fragment of the left thigh were discovered. Between the thumb and first finger of the hand is a hole into which a cantharus, a sort of drinking cup,—picked up close by,—fitted perfectly. Curls and long hair stream down the back of the torso; and four holes on the left breast appear to have held some bronze ornament. The type bears resemblance to that followed, later, by Alkamenes in his celebrated statue of Dionysos. Another torso, that of a satyr, of a good period of art, a bust of a Pan or Silen, reliefs of a goat-sacrifice, a beautiful ivy wreath below a dedicatory inscription to Dionysos,—all found here,—point to the prevalence of the cult of the god at Ikaria.

Prior to these latter finds, however, the torso of a naked male figure of sixth-century style, and of the so-called Apollo type, was discovered. It was followed by a bas-relief of a later period representing Apollo, with long curls, seated on a round object, painted red, presumably the *omphalos*, and holding a lyre, with Artemis and Leto standing behind. Later, amid the remains of some walls, another relief appeared. It again represents a seated Apollo, holding in one hand a twig and in the other a phiale. Artemis stands behind; and a worshipper, heavily draped, approaches the altar in front of the god. The second relief bears a dedicatory inscription; and both are notable by the fact that they are decorated on both sides. These finds indicated that, besides the cult of Dionysos, the Ikarians must have practised also the worship of Apollo Pythius, said to have been introduced to Athens from Marathon. This conjecture was presently confirmed by the discovery of a marble threshold, which bore, in letters of the fourth century, these words: "The Pythion of the Ikarians." This inscription, the more remarkable as being a unique instance of the "labelling" of a Greek temple, gained greatly in importance when, shortly afterwards, the scanty remains of the temple itself, to which it referred, were laid bare.

The other sculptured remains yielded by these excavations number some twenty-five pieces; including a very pretty female head and three sepulchral bas-reliefs in excellent preservation. But the most important of all is an archaic stele representing, in low relief of most delicate and beautiful workmanship, a warrior holding a spear. At

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first sight it appears to be an exact replica of the famous Aristion stele, discovered in 1839 in another part of Attica, and now treasured in the Central Museum; but on closer inspection it reveals slight differences, indicative of a somewhat later style. It also shows but faint traces of coloring; whereas on the Aristion stele, which is assigned to the early part of the fifth century, the coloring is still vivid. It was found serving as a door-sill at the entrance of the church,—fortunately with the sculptured face downwards. Though broken into three parts, it is perfect, with the exception of the head.

As the work progressed, the field of operations extended, and a thorough exploration became a much greater undertaking than was originally expected. It cannot be said that the site has been exhausted. It still invites a closer and more systematic examination. Yet, within the space of three months, with but a few workmen, and at a total outlay of some $600, an important museum of antiquities was formed; and the monuments and inscriptions unearthed, dating from the sixth century B.C. to late Roman times, reveal to us the public and private life of an important centre in Attica, during a period of seven or eight centuries. Well might the late Prof. Curtius declare, at a meeting of the German Institute at Berlin, that these discoveries are "epoch-making." As the site excavated was private property, a portion of the objects found went to the state and a part to the owner; the latter refusing to sell them to the Government, but holding himself responsible for their safe keeping. They have been removed to Stamata, the residence of Mr. Heliopoulos.

At the very outset of the excavations at Ikaria, a third site was explored. The workmen led Mr. Buck two miles to the west of the valley on a ridge, where they said a stone existed "with flowers and letters on it." A grave, partially open, was found here, and near it the torso of a seated woman in high relief, the head of which had been broken off and sent to Germany! One of the sides of the grave was formed by a sepulchral stele which bore two rosettes and an inscription of the fourth century, recording the names of the two deceased: one an Ikarian, and the other an inhabitant of Plotheia. The proximity of the latter deme to that of Ikaria had been surmised, but was now rendered almost certain. Fortunately, fresh light was soon forthcoming on this point, as well as on the location of another deme,—that of Semachidæ.

A short distance from the point just spoken of, and a little beyond the ridge which shuts in on the north the valley leading to Ikaria, lies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the village of Stamata, half-way between Kephisia and Marathon. In the vicinity of the older and now abandoned site of that village three ruined churches are to be seen. One of these, which Mr. Buck visited in November, 1888, promised to yield important information, built up, as it was, of débris collected indiscriminately from ancient structures. Mr. H. S. Washington, of Yale, who had accompanied Mr. Buck, took charge of this exploration on December 27, he generously providing the necessary funds. A couple of days' work sufficed to bring to light, besides various other pieces of sculpture, a very fine and well preserved female torso, larger than life, of archaic workmanship, as well as four inscriptions which satisfactorily established this to have been the chief centre of the hitherto doubtful deme of Plotheia. That of Semachidæ must therefore have been situated in the immediate vicinity.

Before proceeding farther afield, reference must here be made to an exploration which, though undertaken six years later than the Bœotian excavations dealt with at the conclusion of this article, is intimately connected, in point of topography and history, with the work just recorded. Prof. Merriam, under whose directorship of the School the excavations at Ikaria were carried out, encouraged by their brilliant results, had cherished the project of exploring another neighboring locality. He was urged by suggestions similar to those which had led him to St. Dionysius. Not far from that spot, about two and a half miles from the field of Marathon, and eighteen miles from Athens, a small valley, now known by the name of "Koukounari" (a pine-cone), is ensconced at the foot of Pentelicus. Plentiful tile fragments and the rich loam with which the place is covered—a rare feature in Attica—had attracted the attention of Dr. Milchhöffer, who surmised that this must have been the seat of an ancient deme of some importance. His conjecture was strengthened when, from the heap of stones surrounding a ruined church and cloister situated on a narrow and low foot-hill in the valley, he drew the fragments of two votive reliefs. He was now of opinion that the cloister was established on the site of an ancient sanctuary; and he thus wrote in his "Text zu Karten von Attika" (p. 58): "The spot, from its situation and the nature of the soil, promises to the excavator an easy and abundant reward."

Encouraged by this promise, Prof. Merriam, after an absence of six years, returned to Athens, eager to reap new triumphs in that world which he loved so much, and with which he was so intimately acquainted. Though ailing, he could not be deterred from ascending once more the rock of the Acropolis, as if bound on a pilgrimage to the shrine that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

centred his love and admiration. There he contracted a chill; and he died on the fourth day, leaving a void in American scholarship not to be easily filled, and a gap in the ranks of the best friends of Greece. He was a scholar of the ideal type, conscientious and accurate in research, reprobating superficiality, and delighting in that "infinite capacity for taking pains," which Carlyle considered identical with genius.

The appropriation of $200, which he had obtained from the American Institute of Archæology for the purpose of excavating Koukounari, was now entrusted to Prof. R. Richardson, with the request that he undertake the exploration as a memorial service. Under his intelligent superintendence, therefore, work was commenced on February 15, 1895, and was continued with a force of thirty men for four days, Messrs. W. A. Elliott and Th. W. Heermance sharing in the work, with all the hardships which the snow and winter cold in that high region entailed. The soil was soaked with the rains; and its handling became extremely difficult. Prof. Richardson was not sanguine as to the yield of the "old material" of which Milchhöffer speaks as being interspersed in the walls of the ruined buildings; but, in compliance with the wishes of Mr. Heliopoulos, the owner of the property, and in order to carry out the plan of Prof. Merriam, he took down the south and west walls, which were the most dilapidated. Only an anthemion, forming the apex of a sepulchral stele, was found imbedded in these walls. Some other blocks, of the coarse marble quarried from the adjoining hill, were found worked in a manner strikingly similar to the blocks of the same inferior Pentelic stone noticeable in the wall of Themistocles, by the Dipylon Gate at Athens. The door-posts of the church are more carefully wrought, and must have formed parts of some older and nobler building.

The search made outside the church proved more fruitful in evidence corroborative of Milchhöffer's belief that a temple had stood near. No foundations of such a structure were traced; but in the stone-heaps two more fragments of votive reliefs were found: the one, a horse's head,—which, however, does not agree with Milchhöffer's fragment representing a span of horses,—the other, a draped trunk of a male figure seated on an elaborate throne, of excellent workmanship. Eight trenches were next dug down to the virgin soil and bed-rock of the rising ground on which the cloister stood; and in these was discovered a third and important fragmentary relief. It contains the trunks of three persons,—two of majestic pose. The one to the left is nude: the other, draped, is apparently a female figure, with the right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hand extended toward the lip of the nude figure. In the extreme end stands a smaller figure, probably a worshipper. From the joint hands of the two larger figures proceeds downward what seems to be a club. These details are essential, as bearing out Milchhöffer's theory that here lay the deme of Hekale. The relief appears to represent the meeting of Theseus and Hekale, as related by Plutarch ("Theseus," c. 14). A poor old woman, tradition said, befriended and entertained the young hero when he sallied forth to rid the country of the Marathonian bull; and she vowed to offer up sacrifices for his success. She died, however, before he returned; and Theseus therefore ordered the inhabitants of the Tetrapolis of Marathon regularly to offer up sacrifices to Zeus Hekaleius in honor of the good Hekale, after whom the deme, where her sanctuary stood, was also named.

In connection with this relief, Milchhöffer's conjecture that this deme lay here gained greatly in strength by the discovery, made during the very first half-hour of the exploration, of an inscription of exceptional importance. Between the church and the cloister a slab of Pentelic marble was found, originally inscribed on both sides; but as it had been reduced to serve as a door-sill, the exposed face had been trodden almost smooth. On the under-face, however, fifty-six lines, engraved in two columns, are still clearly legible. Though the beginning and the end of the inscription are broken off, the remaining text, which Prof. Richardson has published, accompanied with learned commentaries, shows it to be of the order of "sacrificial calendar" inscriptions, such as the Greeks set up in places where sacrifices were made very frequently. Lysias, in his oration (xxx. 17) against Nikomachos, speaks of sacrifices offered according to the prescriptions of similar tablets, fragments of which had been recovered in the course of previous excavations; but this is by far the most complete and important specimen of the kind yet found. It enumerates, within its extant portion, no less than thirty-nine divinities, the names of several of which do not occur elsewhere; it prescribes the animals, etc. to be offered as sacrifices, and states the prices to be paid. This last feature alone is a valuable contribution to the history of prices of commodities in ancient Greece. With regard however to the identification of the locality,—since the presumption is strong that so large a stele has remained where it was originally set up,—the inscription defines the sacrifice offered "by the inhabitants of the Tetrapolis" and repeatedly refers to the "hero" and the "heroine." So that, although the name of Hekale does not appear in the extant portion, it may,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very probably, have been recorded in the missing preamble. The form of the letters and the style of orthography place the date of the inscription between 440 and 360 B.C. These not inconsiderable results—especially the importance of the inscription—had decided Prof. Richardson to resume and complete the exploration of Koukounari at some later season; particularly as only half the appropriation had been expended in the first attempt.

When the excavations of Ikaria and Stamata were brought to a close, the task of the American explorers was considered as ended in Attica; and their interest was centred in the adjoining province of Bœotia. The attention of archæologists had already been drawn to that quarter by a number of unusual objects—the outcome of surreptitious excavations—which dealers in antiquities had been offering for some time previously in the market of Athens. In the spring of 1888, the German School had undertaken some search near Thebes, in connection with the imperfectly known worship of the Kabeiroi, to which those objects related. And, consequently, with the recommendation of the Ephor-General of Antiquities, the American School applied, in the winter of 1888, and obtained permission of the Greek Government, to explore the sites of Anthedon and Thisbe.

The ancient geographer, Stephanus of Byzantium, explains the name of Anthedon by the abundance of flowers which remains to this day a distinguishing feature of the locality. Homer ("Iliad," ii. 508) first speaks of the town as the farthermost in Bœotia. Pausanias, Strabo, Theolytus,—the last-mentioned a poet quoted by Athenæus (vii. 296),—and the author of the description of Greece commonly attributed to Dikæarchos, refer to Anthedon as situated on the Euripus, the strait of Eubœa, at the foot of Mount Messapion, seventy stadia from Chalcis and a hundred and sixty from Thebes. These indications were sufficient to enable the most critical of modern travellers in Greece, Colonel Leake ("Trav. in N. Greece," 271–5), to identify the site by the remains of certain walls which he observed about a mile and a half to the north of the village of Loukisi; which latter he connects with the Nisa of Homer. Leake, whose inferences were confirmed by subsequent travellers, gives a sketch-plan of the site, which served as an initial guide to the American explorers.

The pseudo-Dikæarchos speaks of Anthedon as a small town with an *agora* surrounded by a double portico, and planted with trees. Pausanias refers to the sacred grove and sanctuary of the Kabeiroi "somewhere about the centre of the city"; close to it he places the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

temple of Demeter and Kora; outside the walls, that of Dionysos, with a statue in marble; and finally, near the sea, the so-called Leap of Glaucus, which, as Mr. Buck thinks, "was probably a natural cliff like the numerous Lovers' Leaps on our eastern coast";—most likely the abrupt declivity of the rock of the Acropolis facing the sea. Glaucus, Pausanius explains, was a fisherman of Anthedon, but was metamorphosed into a maritime deity, predicting the future, and delivering oracular responses which seafaring and other men believed. From him the Anthedonii derived their origin; and, like him, they led the lives of sailors, fishermen, and shipwrights. That they were of a different race than the rest of the Bœotians is certain; but the fact that they ultimately joined the Bœotian League has been established by one of the inscriptions recently unearthed.

Work on the site was begun on March 5, 1889, under Mr. J. C. Rolfe, of Harvard, son of the well-known Shakespearian scholar, and was continued, with some twenty-five workmen, for three weeks; Mr. C. D. Buck being also present. The entire area of the ancient town, which was soon ascertained to be more extensive from south to north than indicated in Leake's plan, was under cultivation as grain-fields. The exploration therefore was started at the "platform" by the sea; and fourteen trenches were dug in different directions from it inward. The foundations of a most extensive and intricate structure, connected with the platform, were thus unearthed; but nothing was found indicative of its character or purpose. It covers so large a stretch of ground that a visitor to the excavations thought it must be the town itself. Leake styled the remains, as he saw them, "a public building"; but the most reasonable surmise is that they were those of the *agora* and *stoa*. The foundations belong to a good Greek period; but some of the walls are of later and inferior workmanship. In the southern portion a beautiful Roman mosaic floor was laid bare.

As the area of the town contained no other visible remnant that could serve as guide to further search, a very long trench, with two lateral branches, was now dug across, from the southern slope of the Acropolis to the city walls, in the hope of coming upon the temple of the Kabeiroi. This work, as well as some trials made on the hill of the Acropolis, yielded no results; but an inspection of the city walls revealed more extensive remains than those indicated by Leake. A small hill, which rises immediately outside these walls, seemed a promising spot on which to seek for the temple of Dionysos; since the locality agreed with the language of Pausanias. Three trenches were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consequently opened, in one of which certain foundations were met with; and these, having been followed up and cleared of earth, showed the substructure of a very small temple built of well cut blocks of the local porous stone. A Doric capital and the unfluted drum of a column, lying near, strengthened the belief that this must have been the site of the shrine of Dionysos. A further trial was made on a low hill, east of the town, on the road to Chalcis, where fragments of Doric architecture—one piece still retaining traces of color—and a number of inscriptions were unearthed. Two of these record dedications to Artemis Eilithyia, the goddess aiding women in child-bed; and these inscriptions, coupled with the architectural remains discovered, point to the existence of a temple of that divinity in this neighborhood.

In one of the trenches, which was carried a hundred feet beyond the temple of Dionysos, a collection of some twenty-five implements and small ornaments was found, together with sheet bronze and a quantity of bronze slag,—evidently remnants of a bronze-smith's factory. These objects, which are now exhibited in the Central Museum at Athens, include two-edged axes, chisels, drills, an awl, a sickle-like razor, and a large variety of knives. Some, similar to those recently discovered on the Acropolis of Athens are used; while others are apparently fresh from the hands of the maker. But the most considerable results of these excavations are the inscriptions. Hitherto only one inscription from Anthedon was known to exist. No less than sixty are now available for study; ranging from the fifth century B.C. to the second century of our era. Most of these are very short; but they are all of the highest importance, elucidating and supplementing, as they do, the local peculiarities of the Bœotian dialect.

The work at Anthedon, as it will have been seen, was rather promiscuous, and was considered as "merely experimental." While it was still in progress, Mr. Rolfe, entrusting the further superintendence to Mr. Buck, undertook, on March 27, at the head of fifteen men, the exploration of Thisbe, the site of which he had examined a week earlier. Leake ("Northern Greece," ii. 506) had identified the modern village of Kakosia with the ancient Thisbe. It stands at a small distance from the Gulf of Corinth, under the southern slope of Helicon,

> "between two great summits of the mountain, which rise majestically above the vale, clothed with trees in the upper part and covered with snow at the top. . . The modern village lies in a little hollow surrounded on all sides by low cliffs. . . The walls of Thisbe were about a mile in circuit, following the crest of the cliffs, and are chiefly preserved at the southeast."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Leake further describes the masonry of these walls, the remains of a mole or causeway across the marshy plain to the south, as also the ruin of a Hellenic tower or station on a ridge looking down upon the port of Thisbe, now known as Vathỳ ("the deep"),—a beautiful little harbor encircled by rocks and wooded hills. These, as well as the islands beyond, are to this day peopled by flocks of the wild doves which, as Strabo and Stephanus of Byzantium state, earned for Thisbe the Homeric designation of *polytreron*, "abounding in doves" ("Iliad," ii. 502). Both Ovid ("Metam.," xi. 300) and Statius ("Thebaid," vii. 261) speak of the Thisbæan doves; and Leake found them to be equally plentiful in the woods around Kakosia. Pausanias refers to the temple of Herakles at Thisbe, and to the statue of the hero which it enshrined.

Though the modern settlement is a small one, it must have been a place of considerable importance—owing no doubt to its strong defensive position—in Byzantine times. No less than twenty churches of that epoch, most of them now in ruins, may be counted on the site. Around one of these, the church of St. Luke,—standing within the village, but outside the ancient walls,—Mr. Rolfe dug some trenches, which yielded only a pillar of very fine Byzantine workmanship and ornamentation. The walls of two other ruined churches were taken down; and here some inscribed tombstones were found. In all, fifteen inscriptions were recovered; and they are published by Messrs. Rolfe and Tarbell in the fifth volume of the "Papers." The earliest publication of a Thisbæan inscription is due to the Greek Meletius, who visited the spot a century before Leake. The original stone of this inscription, Leake was unable to find; but he transcribed four other engraved slabs. The abundant yield of inscriptions, even after so cursory and superficial a search, was full of promise. But the exploration of Thisbe also was confined to tentative operations only. It was explained that "as the modern village stands directly on the ancient site, extensive excavations must involve considerable expense." The explorers therefore decided to concentrate all their energies on the more attractive site of Plataia, which had been included in the concession made to them to excavate at Anthedon and Thisbe. And to Plataia I shall follow them in my next article.

J. GENNADIUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. CLEVELAND AND THE SENATE.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S administration of eight interrupted years draws to its close. And eventful years they have been indeed; full of national difficulty and danger, of official trial, temptation, and discouragement, and yet, as the fair-minded of all political prepossessions must admit, stamped by an executive purpose, honorable, heroic, and conservative of the public interests.

Mr. Cleveland has long been a sturdy and striking figure in our politics. Whether, on the whole, successful or unsuccessful in his national policy, he must, at all events, be pronounced true and consistent to the grand principles which brought him twice into power, turning neither to the right nor to the left for adventitious favors. If ever open to censure as parcelling out some great offices to pacify unworthy feudatories, he has filled the best places for the most part with the best men, while in the lesser patronage that falls to a President he has done more than all his predecessors combined to place the civil service permanently above the reach of scrambling and scandalous jobbery. If, a year ago, he was execrated by many who had once praised him for outbidding, as they thought, the jingoism of Congress in menacing England with war, he has since conducted that Venezuelan issue to so happy an adjustment that the war clouds have cleared altogether and friendship with the mother country is reëstablished on surer foundations than ever before, under the auspices of an arbitration treaty which, if confirmed by the Senate, opens that new dawn of justice and humanity in the dealings of nations for which kings and prophets waited. For all the triumphs, external and internal, of his two administrations, Mr. Cleveland deserves the chief praise; in all the disappointments, and they are many, he has borne the chief obloquy. The wisest majority of our people, regardless of party ties, have learned to trust him for his steadfastness to principle, his prudence, his regard for the material needs of business, and his personal integrity. He has held the helm of state with a strong hand. He has saved us from many dangers, at his own seeming sacrifice. Unless we greatly mistake, his sure pilotage will be missed for many years to come. He is the only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man of his party faith for nearly two generations who has been trusted with the guidance of this Union; and, unless the politicians of that party realize better their own need of leaders who are true Democrats and not levellers of prosperity, he is likely to prove the last of their candidates installed at the White House for a generation longer.

One source of Mr. Cleveland's strength and dignity in supreme office appears in the rare character and ability which he has brought into his cabinet under each administration. Democrats more deserving of the country's confidence could hardly be found than such as Bayard, Manning, Fairchild, and Whitney, during his first term; or Gresham, Olney, Carlisle, Wilson,—indeed one might name almost the whole list,—of his second. They were not only among the safest and best of representative democracy; they were statesmen besides, men of comprehensiveness in action by whose side the twaddlers and tricky managers of a political sect, never without lesser chiefs to blush for, must forever dwarf by comparison. The inability of such administration advisers to hold recent Congresses in smooth coöperation must be largely ascribed to adverse circumstances; perhaps in part to the stern attitude of the President himself, and still more to a policy which did not please the weather-wise of his party in the Senate. It is invidious to complain that some of these Presidential advisers were unused to Congressional ways; for Whitney, Manning, Lamont, and others of these Cleveland cabinets—who never sat in Congress in their lives—have worked the two Houses with a readier touch than Bayard or Carlisle, men whom, of all Democrats, one would have thought the most likely, just after leaving the Senate, to influence that body, and indeed both branches. President Cleveland's surviving associates of the past four years have shared loyally the fortunes and misfortunes of their chief; they now go together into political retirement, preferring firm and stable principle to mercurial popularity. Democracy as a responsible organism in the conduct of this Union is, for the present, overwhelmed.

With such leaders in exile among their opponents, Republicans may well rejoice. Their renewed opportunity for a long sway of the political sceptre is a bright one; and only the repetition of old follies, or an imbecile delay in restoring public and private credit and prosperity by wise legislation can harm the supremacy of that historical party for a long time. If overthrown four years hence under these new conditions of power, it will be by some essentially new party, to whose untried leaders a long-suffering and tossing community turns in despair. Never again will the plain people trust the delirium-tremens combination

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that, last summer, in the Chicago convention, profaned the sacred name of Democrat by refusing to this truly democratic administration even a perfunctory tribute of valedictory praise for having striven to fulfil the party pledges given solemnly in convention four years earlier. Organized folly, if once invested with power, can, unquestionably, accomplish much toward impoverishing the rich and pauperizing the poor; but one might as well place a hammer and glass mirror in a young child's hands as expect such a coalition to manage finance or adjust those delicate relations of labor and capital which must always be mutual. We have enough public servants who will turn from the intricate problems of trade and finance, which their minds can never grasp, to the more congenial study of building up political capital and circulating the spoils of office; who are ready to tie up measures for the public welfare in order to gratify a personal spite or vanity; who show themselves either bosses or the minions of a boss; who, when revenue and economy are wanted, will increase wasteful expenditures and throw open the doors to hoggish protection; who rail at the sensitiveness of other nations to our interference in their domestic quarrels, forgetting the popular temper in America when France and England proposed to end the inhuman bloodshed of our own civil war; who, especially if dwellers far inland, are quite ready to plunge this country into a reckless war with Europe for an uncertain gain, before providing prudent coast defences on the Atlantic shore, and while the treasury staggers already under the incumbrance of our last war's pensions; and who, after the overblown bubbles of prosperity have collapsed, are ready to kick the bucket of common sense, hoping that somehow if things are only stirred up prosperity will come back. Of such miscalled statesmen we have enough and to spare at the present time; but of statesmen who comprehend what is needful for the people, and who stand up to their comprehension, the material is quite too scanty to be wasted.

Mr. Cleveland has stood for strong prerogatives as an Executive; and this again has been partly compelled by circumstances and by his frequent isolation from Congressional support. So in turn were those former great popular chieftains, Jefferson and Jackson, strong Executives, of whose honest sincerity in the democratic faith he partakes, while differing much in methods and character from either of them. Jefferson had the magnetism of recognized superiority and a plastic touch, such as moulded the Legislature implicitly to his will. Jackson forced and defied Congress, or rather the Senatorial branch of it, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long possessed consummate leaders openly opposed to him; but, determined to have his own way, he used the whole force of his military popularity and of the dispensation of patronage with bold, unsparing, and even unscrupulous effect to exalt his personal friends in power and displace all enemies. Cleveland, on the other hand, has been faithful and earnest for correct principles,—as posterity will some day acknowledge,—and the sympathy of the people has strengthened him against his foes among the politicians; but in Jeffersonian tact he has been greatly wanting; while to the rude Jacksonian push his self-restraint and magnanimous nature prove a constant obstacle. Principles more than places have interested him; and, leaving his enemies to goad and torment him without hindrance, he has used as his great compelling force upon Congress, wherever he has used force at all, the pressure of external public opinion. On occasion, as in the repeal of the silver-purchase act, he has used that force with telling effect; but latterly in so exhausting an antagonism—for a man of his lofty endeavors and lofty manner of putting things is sure to antagonize—he has been blocked by his enemies and discomfited. His fight with Congress, and an exasperating Senate more especially—that body which has so much to do with approving or disapproving treaties and appointments—has been almost incessant; during his first and more successful term it was with a controlling majority of political opponents; but during his second with a malignant faction rather of his own party. How deep-set the cause of opposition in this latter period we could only realize when the Chicago convention showed the current that had set for socialism and free silver at the South and West; and yet the schism was in some sense that of personal resistance to a President who was autocratic for law and order. As a final consequence Mr. Cleveland has schooled himself to a partial defeat. Most of his grand achievements of the past four years have been less by way of reform than in salutary constraint. The bow of promise which spanned his first truly successful term and reappeared at an interval has vanished in the terrible gloom of business depression. Yet these achievements, and the efforts to achieve, will be gratefully remembered in coming years; and the only popular regret will be that so great a statesman had not shown himself equally great as a politician.

Among the public measures with which this second administration is permanently identified are some which provoked criticism in various quarters, as though the President had stretched arrogantly and illegally

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his claim of constitutional authority. Most of those issues have ceased greatly to interest. There was first of all the Hawaiian conquest, aided artfully by an American minister for annexation to the Union, shortly before Mr. Cleveland came into office. We who sustained him heartily in his singular policy of sending out a commissioner paramount and blocking the whole game of national aggrandizement, and yet not without strong misgivings as to the feasibility of restoring the dethroned queen, have not ceased to rejoice over the final turn taken in getting rid of the whole troublesome business. If Hawaii comes up again as an incident, under Mr. Cleveland's successor, as perhaps it may, the real legal issue of interest will be, not whether commissioners paramount may be sent out; but whether, under our existing Federal Constitution, and without amendment of any kind, a President may at any time, by a secret negotiation confirmed in the Senate, with perhaps a quorum majority ready in the House to complete the transfer, annex to the United States and admit at discretion as a full State having co-equal rights with our present mass of American citizens, Japan or any intermediate island of the Pacific archipelago, without popular appeal by intermediate election or ultimate reference of any sort, and with no change in the Federal organic law. Hitherto it has been supposed that sovereignty resided under our system in the American people, in those already of that description; and though, to be sure, as in the case of Texas, we have been dragged into unwilling war in times past, for the sake of adjacent annexation, we never were so compelled for distant conquest; and indeed, the widest scope of our "manifest destiny" ambition was bounded at farthest by the limits of this ample western continent, which appears to supply range enough for a single written instrument of organic law to unite, under a system which knows no permanent condition but that of co-equal and equally republican States.

Then came the Debs riot at the Central West, which but for the President's prompt intervention with Federal troops might soon have broadened into an organized rebellion against vested property. The constitutionality of that intervention—which so many deprecated—has been affirmed by the Supreme Court with an emphasis that rioters and dilatory State governors will do well to ponder over. Indeed, no constitutional issue is left over this courageous action on Mr. Cleveland's part, except for the late threat of the Altgeld Democracy at Chicago to pack that tribunal with more facile judges and get the decision reversed. The same resort has been threatened for reëstablishing a national income tax—that first grand error of legislation by the House

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which came in with Mr. Cleveland, disclosing its socialistic leanings. As to any permanent tax of the kind, it saddles in theory the cost of Federal government upon the small fraction of citizens and of States deemed wealthy, that the great majority of our people may go exempt; while in practice it would discourage private prosperity, already burdened with an annual State and municipal tax of the kind, and so check accumulation as ultimately to drain off the common resources of a livelihood. Economy of expenditure is a far better public doctrine than increase of revenue for hard times like these. At this very day there are premature towns and cities near and beyond the Rocky Mountains, the headquarters of present discontent, whose running expenses are largely met by oppressive assessments upon non-residents of the East who invested a few years ago in their boastful promises and then had to foreclose and take possession.

Last and latterly we have that new constitutional issue between the Executive and Senate, provoked by the Cuban Revolution, which involves the delicate decision of belligerent recognition and the risk of European war. That discussion is still open and has for our people an immediate interest. With all deference to the responsible claims that have been advanced on either side of the question, it seems to the present writer that neither the Executive nor Congress can monopolize public authority, regardless of the other, so far as constitutional right is concerned; but that their concurrence and coöperation are essential to new action. Neither, on the one hand, can Congress appropriately initiate war or the recognition of a belligerent without the President; nor on the other can the President make war or admit a revolutionary community into the family of independent nations without Congress. The exercise of a veto power does not exhaust apparently the opposing resources of the Executive; nor is Congress confined to passing or refusing to pass a joint resolution; but whenever Executive and Congress honestly disagree in such foreign policy, negation becomes the true constitutional result, unless public opinion or a spirit of concession can induce them to coöperate.

Let us develop the argument somewhat in detail for the remainder of this article. During the American Revolution and while the old Articles of Confederation lasted, all sovereign authority of this Union, such as it was, vested in the Continental Congress,—a Congress, it will be remembered, composed of only a single chamber, and, under a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system which ignored popular representation altogether, a body very much like our present Senate in being composed of delegates, chosen usually by a State legislature, who voted simply as the unit (not as now the duplicated units), of the co-equal State represented. To that Congress (which in these days we would consider rather a convention or grand committee) all the functions of war and foreign relations were given; and yet, without an Executive head, those functions were so hard to sustain properly, that a Secretary's bureau was created for a Congressional agency. When the Constitution of 1787 was promulgated for general adoption, with an independent Executive and Judiciary, the practice of European governments was closely imitated. A President headed a new and distinct department of government under the remodelled Union; nor were the framers of our Constitution the less inclined to strengthen the Executive, when Congress itself developed into a bi-cameral body, based in its House upon population, and when, too, it was understood that the first President of the United States to be chosen would equal in dignity and the capacity to rule any crowned head of the civilized world. To the new Congress, then, was left, as before, the fundamental power to declare war; coupled with authority to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to provide for calling forth the militia.[1] For had not the immortal Declaration of 1776 proceeded from a Congress? But as to foreign diplomatic relations and a republican court, the only specific and immediate grant of power was to the President of the United States; it was he alone who was vested with authority to appoint (with the advice and consent of the Senate) "ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls," "to receive ambassadors and other public ministers"; and (with a two-thirds consent of the Senate) "make treaties."[2] This was no oversight; for the Articles of Confederation had pursued a different course.

Obviously then,—and the whole practice of government has hitherto conformed to that idea—the general management of foreign relations, which so often requires promptness of action and great secrecy in emergencies, besides the balancing of various foreign governments, belongs properly to the Executive branch alone; and, while communicating information to Congress on all such subjects, the President does so with a constant reserve of discretion, often in the strictest confidence, and sometimes for reasons of state refusing specific information altogether. It is the President's function to initiate public action in foreign rela-

[1] Constitution, Art. I, § 8. [2] Constitution, Art. II, §§ 2, 3.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, which requires always the handling of many reins. And since any swerving from the line of strict neutrality in a particular instance is likely to embroil us in various quarters, the President of the United States, as responsible head and agent of the people in such concerns, as, with his cabinet, the best informed and most efficient department of government, as the only one in fact who can originate or negotiate a treaty, has, in every great case involving a national precedent, been relied upon, and usually by a message, to give the first immediate direction to war or to belligerent recognition, whenever Congress stands ready to sustain him. Thus was it with President John Adams in the short but indignant outbreak against the French Republic; with the reluctant Madison in our second declaration of war against Great Britain; with Monroe in recognizing the independence of the Spanish-American Republics; as also when denouncing the schemes of the Holy Alliance; with Jackson in taking the part of Texas revolutionists against Mexico; with Polk in leading up craftily to the Mexican war and then sending to Congress his war message; with Lincoln in dealing with the first civil commotions of 1861. During the Maximilian invasion of Mexico, in the course of our civil war, Secretary Seward applied at discretion the Monroe doctrine, as emergencies might permit; yet Congress was never at real variance with the Executive over that policy. True, Congress declares a war constitutionally and provides its sinews; but unless our Legislature is to take a leap in the dark the formulation of a war policy and its justification must rest upon Executive shoulders. And the vaporings of Congress while the Executive, knowing better the true situation, declines compliance, are never taken by our people very seriously. In older European practice, war and its declaration, as well as diplomacy, are vested in the monarch.

To suppose, for a moment, that Congress wishes active intervention and a war for the conquest of Cuba, while the President from his own point of view conscientiously disapproves the pursuit of such a policy. A joint resolution passes the two Houses, and, after an Executive veto, is sustained by a two-thirds vote. What follows? Our Constitution by its own express terms makes the President commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States and of the State militia whenever called into active service.[1] Not an order can lawfully issue for war operations save as he through his own Secretaries of War and the Navy may direct; not a high military officer can be detailed or ap-

[1] Constitution, Art. II, § 2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pointed save upon his individual choice. If Congress has lawfully declared war, he can just as lawfully manifest his pacific disposition by making a treaty of peace; and if the Senate fails to confirm that treaty he may negotiate another. Or, supposing the immediate point is that of recognizing revolutionists of Spain as belligerents or as an independent republic, the President can, despite mandatory action by Congress, refuse to receive formally a public minister from the would-be nation, or to send a diplomatic functionary in return. It is often through the prudent concert of great powers that such delicate steps are taken at all; and all efforts for such concert lie within the breast of an Executive alone. Congress, to be sure, might impeach and remove summarily from office a President who thus disobeyed; but this would be a highly perilous and almost revolutionary proceeding in any grave crisis, unless the people heartily sympathized with that body, which would rarely happen if the President were believed honest in his convictions of pacific duty. And even if he were removed, the only effect would be to experiment with the constitutional discretion of the Vice-President or other person next in Executive succession, Congress remaining as much out of active control of the situation of the army and navy and of diplomacy as before.

But suppose, on the other hand, that the President, and not Congress, were obstinately bent upon such war or recognition. Though, of course, he might goad to desperation the foreign power he meant to humiliate, so as practically to force hostilities, a joint resolution by Congress, rebuking such a policy, might reconcile that power and smooth the situation; and unquestionably no Executive has the constitutional right to make active war until Congress at its own discretion has formally declared it. Any such Legislature, fitly representing the American sentiment, may rightfully announce its own views of a general foreign policy and strive by enlisting public opinion upon its side to compel the Executive to conform to them. It may, furthermore, under its powers to regulate commerce and raise a revenue, pass such laws over an Executive veto, as may discriminate, retaliate, or otherwise promote ends adverse to those of the Executive, and bind the President to enforce such laws. It may withhold appropriations for army or navy or appropriate under a proviso. It may refuse to aid an increase of the military establishment. And while the Senate may fail to confirm any Presidential nominations to office, or may reject treaties by the wholesale while such collision lasts, Congress in its two branches may hamper and embarrass an obstinate Executive in various ways by its enactments

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without transcending its constitutional powers at all. A fire of resolves making inquest may be kept up by the House; and then, as a last resort, comes impeachment once more; for it is a much easier matter to impeach and remove a President who is trying to plunge the people into a needless and unpopular war than to put out a President who tries honorably his best to prevent one that Congress is bent upon. These same considerations apply in only a lesser degree where the Executive effort which opposes Congress is to make a premature recognition of foreign independence that may compromise the good faith or jeopardize the peace of this Union. In this latter case, while a President may stand upon his constitutional privilege to receive or exchange public ministers, and to institute treaties and foreign relations with the world, Congress may quite as obstinately express its own dissent and refuse to appropriate money for maintaining any such diplomatic relations. Recognition may be with the President, as a formal act; but, where more than a mere recognition of belligerency abroad, it avails little against Congressional resistance.

It would seem, then, a fair conclusion, from the general scope and expression of our Federal organic law, that concurrence and coöperation are highly needful on the part of Executive and Congress, wherever a critical foreign situation is under discussion; and that neither department of government may rightfully or prudently ignore the other in shaping out results. I have of course assumed that on either side the disposition is, honestly and not recklessly or wantonly, to advance the permanent welfare of our people, and to conform to that standard of justice, forbearance, and considerateness toward other nations that we ask other nations to observe toward us in return.

JAMES SCHOULER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

KANSAS: ITS PRESENT AND ITS FUTURE.

TEN years ago, during the boom, when everything in Kansas was running on full time, and when "slam-bang" was the watchword, the head of a great railway system in the State, who had been suddenly called to New York, instructed his private secretary to select and appoint a president and a general manager for a branch road which the greater system had casually swallowed. When the chief returned, he noticed that the new men were not on duty. The private secretary explained that he had not made the appointments because he could not find the right kind of men. "The right kind of men!" cried the superior officer, indignantly. "The right kind of men! Well, in the name of Heaven, what kind of men were you looking for? Men with green ears, striped backs, and iridescent tail-feathers?"

That is the kind of men which the average citizen of the Republic expects to find in Kansas; and this is where the average citizen of the Republic is fooled. Anyone who cares to plod through the mazes of the census figures may learn that in intelligence the Kansas man is a grade or two above the average man; that the Kansas man buys a book or two more, owns a cabinet organ or two more, a watch or two more, reads a newspaper or two more, works a sulky-plow or two more, a reaper and a harvester or two more, rides on a railroad or two more, than the average man in the nation. He looks like a human being; on ordinary topics talks like a human being; loves with a human heart; and fights with human valor. Yet of late, when the Kansas man has flitted down the election-tables, there has been the mystifying apparition of the gentleman with green ears, striped back, and iridescent tail-feathers. The spectacle is startling enough to merit the attention which it attracts. Yet the phenomenon has its natural causes; and when these are understood it is no longer alarming, though it may be interesting.

It may be useful to describe these causes, and to thereby make it clear to our Eastern friends, that Kansas is an American community passing through a process of American civilization in a thoroughly American manner,—kicking as she goes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kansas was marked out on the desert about a generation ago. The word "aid" appeared on the first page of her history, in connection with the "Emigrant Aid Society." The people of the State have received aid ever since. For a while it came in boxes, during the early battles with grasshoppers and drouths: later it arrived in the shape of loan companies, mortgage companies, trust companies. Growth has been forced in the State. A great commonwealth—and it is indeed truly marvellous—has been builded on these prairies by the Kansas people with other people's money. The trouble with Kansas is not that she has forgotten what a great community she has established, but that it has been established with other people's money. Hence the popularity of the slogan, "the rights of the user are paramount to the rights of the owner." That, by the way, is no new theory. It is as old as debt; and the proposition has appealed to the man in debt ever since the first borrower. Seldom, however, has the theorem found an entire community in debt, as it found Kansas. The wonder is not that Kansas was won by the guileful paradox,—for weakness is a very human attribute,—but that so many people should have been found in one community, whose condition was such that the philosophy of the dishonest debtor would move them all alike. In other communities there were debtors. They voted just as the Kansas debtor voted. But Kansas is a young State. She has found little time to pay her debts. She has been busily engaged in making them. The difference between Ohio and Kansas, for instance, does not lie in the kinds of men that inhabit each State, but in the fact that Ohio has had fifty years' start of Kansas in increasing the number of creditors,—the savers, the men on the right side of the ledger. Ohio had as many gentlemen who voted for the rights of the user as Kansas had. When Kansas thrift has been working and saving as many years as Ohio thrift, Kansas may have as virtuous a point of view as Ohio has to-day.

However, there is neither sense nor charity in palliating the transgression of the debtor who refuses to pay his debt by pointing out the fact that the offence is common. It may benefit the Kansas Populist to remember that the guillotine was established in France by people who desired a release from the eternal payment of moneys for which they received no return; while the Kansas man—who flaunted the legend "Hang the Plutocrats!"—was seeking a release from the payment of money which he had received, which he had enjoyed, and which he had spent. The Kansas man is not unique. A considerable minority of the people of every State in the Union voted with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

majority in Kansas. And because that minority is still rather uncomfortably in evidence all through the States it may be worth while to try to get a glimpse of the world from the standpoint of—to denominate him plainly—the American socialist.

And nowhere else is the American socialist so earnest, so outspoken, and so unhampered by scruples as in Kansas. That is because the Kansas man is an American, with no guiding motive, save his desire to kick. When the American does get off the track, he goes farther than anyone. His good sense, however, always brings him back; but while he is away from the reservation, he is a very bad Indian. There are indications that the ghost-dancing in Kansas is done; yet the State remains an excellent field wherein to study existing conditions of American socialism. For in this State men—average men, plain everyday Americans—are living in a social and economic atmosphere rarely to be met with.

Kansas was settled by men who went there for two reasons: First, to maintain a principle. This indicated that they were men of ideals. Second, to make their everlasting fortunes. The people of this generation who live in the Middle, Eastern, and Southern States were born where they live. They were satisfied to let well enough alone. But the men and women who went West, who now populate Kansas and the Western States, were men and women of marked force of character. They had ambition and will-power enough to pick up and leave their former environments. Now it is impossible in any community that everyone can be rich. Some must fall by the way-side; and when many are debtors, as the Kansas people, by force of circumstances, were, the percentage that fail must necessarily be large. In Kansas, and in the West, the man whose life's ambition was thwarted, who, by the edict of nature, was doomed to failure, still had force enough left to complain; to seek some way out of the inevitable misfortune that had overtaken him. A child of the tenement, an hereditary coward, a beggar by association, a menial by education, may be ground lower and lower by the great machine of commerce; but here was a man who had grit and ambition and character enough to cross a continent, who had sufficient intelligence to appreciate the comforts and to long for the luxuries that American civilization uses as rewards of merit. When this man gets tangled up in the machine, the inexorable play of its cogs maddens him. In his anger he has not tried so seriously to get out of the grinding burrs as to break the machine.

The Kansan, in this struggle, has attracted general attention. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world, knowing that the nature of things will not be changed for the Kansas man, any more than for the man who wraps his talent in a napkin, has marvelled at the fantastic fight, and has said, "What a very peculiar man!" He is not a peculiar man. He has merely lost his temper; and he is strong. He is an American off on the wrong tack. Wherever this American is found battling against the natural order,—the order which makes every man responsible for his own success and blamable for his own failure; wherever a man is found seeking aid, other than that of his own two hands and the devices of his own brain, to escape destruction in the industrial mill; wherever a man is found asking his fellow-men to make him, by legislation, the mental or the financial equal of another man,—there is the exponent of the new socialism. The contention with the new socialism is the chief political affair before the American people to-day. And it is a question as vital in Massachusetts as it is in Kansas.

The term "new socialism" may be misleading; for it is the old socialism,—old as the envy of Cain, whose gift was not acceptable. But it is the old socialism under new conditions—conditions exemplified with unusual brilliancy in Kansas. There the average man is the product of the school-house and the printing-press. Indeed it is the very universality of education and enlightenment—which we in Kansas brag of—that brings all this picturesque discontent. For generations the socialist dreamers have said the race would be entirely happy, if men only had equality of opportunity; if every man started out in the world with the same mental equipment that another man enjoyed. In Kansas this condition virtually exists. Yet the mental habit of a considerable number of the people is but a garment of sackcloth. Viewed casually this seems to be a hopeless situation. To the outsider Kansas seems to be a great commonwealth, peopled with strong, ambitious, intelligent men and women, a majority of whom are sitting among the potsherds, and throwing ashes into the air, that is vibrant with lamentations because there are no truffles for dinner. When this description appears as a fairly truthful picture of Kansas, it is natural that the home-seeker and the investor should avoid the State.

The most unfortunate phase of the situation is that the average Eastern observer does not see how conditions in Kansas may be changed. Nevertheless, they may be changed, and are changing.

In extreme Western Kansas, crops are uncertain, and the man on the farm, like *Uncle Remus's* rabbit, is "done bleedged to climb." There the farmer must work ten days in the week and sleep only on holidays.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Life is a serious business with the farmer on the highlands; and, because he has a hard, rough time of it, the casual observer in the East thinks the Western Kansas man is a Populist. The truth is that Western Kansas is more surely a Republican stronghold than any other portion of the State. That is Jerry Simpson's district. Mr. Simpson's vote in the Far-Western counties was smaller this time than it had ever been before. He was elected through Republican defection in the fertile valley of the Arkansas, and in the city of Wichita—the second city in population in the State. Take the Populist vote of this city from Mr. Simpson, and he would still be marshal of Medicine Lodge. And hereby hangs a moral. People who are seriously at work have not time to dawdle away in dreams of Utopia. Put Kansas to work,—at reasonably profitable work,—and the Populist statesmen will be in search of an employment bureau.

It is one of the remarkable facts of the election-table that, with all the noise and hullabaloo of free silver in the late campaign, the Kansas Republicans held their own and increased their vote in the farming districts,—among people honestly at work,—and lost the State by reason of a changed vote in the cities and towns. There the collapsed boom of eight years ago left a considerable number of people with a surplus of leisure on hand, in which to brood over what they called their wrongs. The agricultural statistics indicate that the honest, energetic farmers of Kansas raised one of the largest crops of corn in the world. Other advices seem to furnish conclusive proof that the town-lot agriculturists harrowed the feelings of their fellow-men, and raised a somewhat larger crop of a Kansas staple not to be mentioned "in the presence of *Mrs. Boffin.*" These gentlemen called themselves free-silver Republicans. What a motley crew it was! A galvanized reminiscence; the tail-end of a long and once triumphant procession of demagogues, that had been tramping through Kansas since the days of that prince of demagogues, General Jim Lane. In the beginning this crowd took for its watch-word, "The Smooth Thing"; and never, since the first election was held in Kansas, has it been at a loss to find a gold-brick to trade for an office. Under the guise of Republicanism, every fad, every ism, every fake, every form of "soft soap and molasses," known to politics, has been hawked about the State of Kansas by these charlatans. They never dared to educate a constituent, or advocate a principle because it was right. They have been the curse of Kansas. They were the forerunners of Simpson and Peffer. These mountebanks played upon the emotions of the people until the drivel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Populists fell upon the ears of the dazed and disheartened voters as the wisdom of seers. The successive defeats of the Republicans in Kansas for the past seven years had decimated the ranks of these Don Quixotes. Some of them had been crucified and buried; others had chased their own folly to the political mad-house; while others were in temporary exile for their greed. But free silver was a trumpet-blast that resurrected them all. The free-silver Republicans, —the tail-end of the procession,—under the banner of Buncombe that had led them to many a victory, wheeled out of the Republican line into the ranks of the Populists. It was an affecting spectacle; and it was a great thing for Kansas. For, as a result, the friends of sound money and good government cast the largest vote ever known in the State,—when the decreased population is taken into consideration.

The combined opposition to the Republican party defeated good government in Kansas last fall by a narrow vote; but Election Day left the Republican party in the State stronger than it had ever been before. For the first time in the history of the Republican organization, it made an honest fight on an issue. The gentlemen who have appeared before conventions in the past, advising a "straddle,"—the "smooth thing,"—are either dead or in the "sure-thing" party. For the first time since the war, honest patriotism is doing business in Kansas politics. Young Republicanism—as opposed to old demagoguery—is in the saddle. This party made a manly fight for truth, and increased the party vote of two years ago several per cent.

So much for what, until the next election, must be called "the minority party" in Kansas. As for the majority party,—the party now in power in the State,—there is every reason to believe that it is badly frightened at its own shadow, and that the war-whoop of the campaign will not be carried into the Leedy administration. Leedy seems to desire to cease blowing blood into the ears of capital; and, if he be left to his own counsel, he will probably make a reasonably good Governor. The danger that now threatens is, that the free-silver demagogues who left the Republican party for cause will get around the Governor and persuade him to be a demagogue. If a man may be judged by the first days of his administration, one would say, that Leedy will have backbone enough to cast out the whole nefarious, designing *junta*, and to give Kansas an ordinary administration.

Just now there is much talk of conservatism among the Populists; and if this bear fruit, Kansas will indeed have cause to be happy. This apparent change of heart has been the direct result of a salutary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drubbing which the Republican papers of Kansas and the editors and public men of the East gave the Kansas Populists after the election. It made them wince; and it tamed them. They had a great deal to say about the defamers of Kansas at the time. The gentlemen who have really defamed Kansas are they whose official careers in the State have made the truth about Kansas highly objectionable reading. The defamers of Kansas are the gentlemen and others who are trying to make the darkest chapter in Kansas history repeat itself.

To-day, Kansas offers the best field for conservative investments in certain lines to be found in the United States. The demagogues having been driven out of the party that stands for honest money and good government, that organization is to-day stronger—morally as well as numerically—than it has ever been. The cranks among the Populists having been frightened into silence, that party, although in power, is less dangerous than it has ever been. Kansas has been cleansed by fire; and the cleansing seems to be thorough.

Kansas has been in a ferment; and the explosion has come. Every new community passes through something of this sort,—the settling of the first mortgage, either by foreclosure or by partial payment and renewal. In the Middle States the war came with its rising prices and averted bankruptcy. Kansas had no civil war; but the mortgage came due on a falling market. The hardships incidental to settlement made many otherwise sane and honest men forget reason and honor. They have been taught a lesson. The gas of the ferment has escaped. Kansas is steadily decreasing her public debt; and her citizens are paying off the principal and keeping track of the interest coupons. There are, however, boom debts that never will be paid. These debts were made by crazy men on both sides of the bargain; and such debts are made and cancelled by time in every community in the world. They should not be laid at the door of the thrifty people of Kansas.

For three hundred miles west of the Missouri River there lies the most fertile territory on the globe. The rainfall is bounteous and regular. There has not been a total crop-failure within the memory of man. The men and women who settled here in the 'sixties and the 'seventies have been following the course pursued by settlers of other new countries. They have been laying out section lines, surveying, taking directions, and speculating in land. They found it so easy to get rich in making out deeds, that they did not establish industries. They did not take an inventory of their resources. Trading was followed by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speculation; speculation, by gambling; gambling, by collapse, depression, and stagnation. That has been the usual history of pioneering; and it has been the history of Kansas. For the past six years business in the State has been stagnant. But these years have been a season of debt-paying and saving. No Kansas banks of importance have failed during that time. Populism has not affected the people who have been actively engaged in reclaiming the credit of the State,—the people at work. When one considers what a narrow majority the combined opposition to good government had last fall, one may realize what a determined army of sane, hard-working people there is redeeming Kansas from the discredit which the idle dreamers have put upon her. And herein lies the hope of Kansas. Put every one in the State to work. Then there will be no more "new socialism" in Kansas; no more airy persiflage about the rights of the user.

Already encouraging signs may be seen. Nearly every Kansas newspaper contains references to the establishment of small industries, by local capital, all over the State. It is the old story. Kansas is finding herself,—just as the Middle States found themselves a generation ago. The people now in Kansas are finding out what there is to do business on; and they are beginning to do business.

This natural development of the resources of the State should not be confused in the minds of the investor with the mad waste of money that occurred in Kansas ten years ago. Looking backward to that time, it seems strange that people should have put money into the schemes that then flourished,—a car-wheel foundry, for instance, a thousand miles from iron; a freight-car factory hundreds of miles from lumber, with nothing but corn to haul in the cars; a bridge foundry a hundred miles from any stream that might not be cleared by an agile steer at a single jump; a watch factory in a country where people were borrowing money to pay their interest coupons; a woollen-mill a day's journey by rail from fuel or power; a carriage factory, where people could not pay cash for wagons. These economic air-castles, and hundreds like them, arose, absorbed Eastern money, and fell,—leaving Kansas with nothing but a bad name. Then, the syndicate flourished. Now, the man with a few thousands in the bank is the *entrepreneur*. During the boom, printing-presses were clicking off stocks and bonds day and night. Now, one man—a thrifty foreman from some Eastern shop, or a practical business man with growing boys—is "the captain and crew of the Nancy brig." There is no display of double leads and startling heads in the newspapers in these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

days; no "Dirt Will Begin To Fly" announcements; no clamors to "Vote The Bonds." The growth is slow, easy, and unpretentious.

By this sign, the sign of the village smoke-stack, shall Kansas conquer. An idle man is emotional, often erratic. There is logic in work. Work is the order of things. A man at work may be trusted with any charge. And as Kansas gets more and more deeply interested in business she will drop politics. Kansas politics has always been "a bad lot" because the people have taken it so seriously. They have expected to find in the wares of the fakirs the magic stone that would transform the prairie into a paradise. They have been sold time and again. It is still the hard old prairie. From now on, the friends of Kansas—and what a host of true friends Kansas has in the East; friends who feel a warm and tender sentiment for her—will not talk politics. They will talk business. She is a little queer on politics, is Kansas; but careful, considerate treatment for a year or two will stop the local irritation altogether. It will not be wise to send pamphlets and speakers to Kansas for some time. The best way to lend a hand in Kansas to-day is to make two small smoke-stacks breathe blackly where but one has breathed before. Small industrial investments, wisely and conservatively made and closely managed, will yield fair returns. The State is eaten up with freight rates. All raw materials are shipped a thousand miles and shipped back again for consumption. The smoke-house, with its hickory chips and its corn-cobs, is unknown. The rock that once held down the pickled pork in the barrel under the cellar stairs has been cut into a corner-stone for some empty building, —a monument to the folly of the boom. Industrially Kansas is little in advance of the Indians. The Kansas farmer swaps off everything he has for something to eat and something to wear. He manufactures nothing. He pays freight on his raw material to the mill, as well as on the finished product back to the farm.

All this must change. The second generation proposes to change it. The transformation will perforce change Kansas. And in the future, the apparition of the gentleman with the green ears, the striped back, and the iridescent tail-feathers may cease to hover over the Kansas election-tables. The State may become humdrum, like Indiana perhaps. She may lose her place, "top of column next to pure reading-matter," in the newspapers. For thirty-six years, Kansas has been always interesting, and seldom right. Let us hope that when she becomes less interesting she will be more frequently right.

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW LETTERS OF EDWARD GIBBON.

THE two volumes of Gibbon's "Letters" now first published with his "Memoirs" are most pleasant reading; they throw new light on the character of the historian and his age; and they are thoroughly well edited and annotated. The so-called "Letters" that the first Lord Sheffield gave to the world just a hundred years ago were merely scraps, cuttings, and occasional specimens culled from the great mass which the third Earl now gives to the curious public. Most of the personal history, all the scandal, and many of the piquant epigrams were withheld by the prudence of the noble executor and the prudery of his daughter. Those who wish to look into the inner life of one of the greatest of English men of letters, and into British society at home and abroad in the first half of the reign of George III, may now study both in the exact transcript of Gibbon's "Familiar Letters."

The "fierce light that beats upon" a great name now reveals to us the historian as one of the most genial, affectionate, sane, and contented natures in literary history—with a genius for friendship, indulgent almost to a fault toward all failings, gently fond of all pleasant things and people, and willing to put up with much for the sake of an easy life. Never was any man less heroic, who less pretended to the heroic, with more perfectly worldly ideals, and a more instinctive repugnance to any enthusiasm. A cosmopolitan *philosophe* of the eighteenth century to the bone, with all the optimism, the cool brain, the *apolausticism*, the insensibility to the moral and spiritual reformation to come, which mark the literary aristocrat of the time. We are not likely now to over-rate the good sense and good nature of such men. We see all their blindness, their grossness, their egoism. But their culture and their balance of mind still interest us. The life they led fascinates us in a way, as does the life of Horace and of Pliny. Peace to their ashes! Let us utter a half-pagan sigh over the classical urn, sacred to the *Dîs Manibus* of the historian of Rome.

His friend judiciously expunged from the published remains nearly all that records the troubles and embarrassments which weighed on him through life. We now see well enough why the historian gave up

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Parliament, public life, London society, and at last his native country. His father kept Gibbon until middle life strictly his dependant under his own will and rule; and at his own death left his only child, then aged thirty-three, a man practically ruined, with several estates hopelessly incumbered. The son, then a grown man of reputation and ambition, struggled manfully for some years to maintain his step-mother, to clear the wreck of their fortunes, and to keep the position into which he had been bred. At last, without repining, he quietly withdrew to the foreign land where so large a part of his life was passed, and devoted himself entirely to his gigantic task. The father, an insatiable man of pleasure, was one of those popular men of the world whose charm and *bonhomie* disguise the real selfishness and cruelty of their domestic lives.

At the age of nine the poor child who became Edward Gibbon was sent from his father's home, which he saw very little again until the age of twenty-one. From sixteen to twenty-one, he was kept at Lausanne, in spite of his entreaties that he might leave it, and he was forced to give up the admirable woman to whom he had engaged himself. At twenty-one, he was brought home and called on to cut off the entail of his settled estate and to join in raising a heavy mortgage. A year later he was dragged into the militia by his father, and served as a soldier in camp for two years and a half. His foreign journey, from which such great things resulted, was cut short by the extravagance and commands of the father. And when, after a few more troubled years, the father died, the young student found himself involved in difficult family embarrassments which were not finally disentangled at his death at fifty-six. It is plain from this entire correspondence, and especially from the dignified remonstrance to his step-mother in 1771 (Letter 113), that the son was in no way to blame, but had acted, as he proudly says, with filial duty and personal economy. His good sense enabled him to see all the weaknesses and follies of his father; but he uniformly speaks of these with affectionate reserve. Nor is there in this mass of letters any trace of ignoble complaint.

Another remarkable feature of these Letters is the complete absence of those controversies, jealousies, and heartburnings which so often distress the lives of literary men. Gibbon never seems to have had an enemy—except the gout; and he never grumbles at any one but the lawyers and the money-dealers, and that in a tone which is half burlesque. The cruel sarcasms of the history melt in his letters into playful banter; as a correspondent at least, if not as an author, he is perfectly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clean, good-natured, and natural. There is an amazing silence as to all that is spiritual and profound—but nothing cynical, nothing profane. He is shrewd, sensible, self-possessed to a fault, but he never has to resort "to the obscurity of a learned language" to cover his indecorum. He has nothing of the devil and rattle of Byron, nor the inimitable babble of Horace Walpole. He has not the pathetic charm of Cowper, nor the burly passion of Johnson. But the imperturbable good sense and the vast erudition and experience of this typical cosmopolitan *virtuoso* throw a vivid light—it may be a somewhat lurid and melancholy light—upon the highest stratum of culture on the eve of the great Revolution.

His first letter, at sixteen, is all that the good boy ought to say to his papa who had banished him abroad. His books were seized at Calais, in order to be examined by the censor (this was in 1753). In a month he understood French, and in a year or so he had almost forgotten how to write English. He talks of his "*evasion*," "what *party* can he take?", a "plain *recite*," and he hears of a thing "by the *canal* of a certain Mr. Hugonin." At nineteen he cannot exist at Lausanne without his d'Herbelot's "Bibliothèque Orientale." Though he had never seen his new step-mother, he writes to his father in French—"assurez ma chère mère (c'est avec bien du plaisir que je lui donne ce titre) de tous les sentimens que ce nom sacré emporte avec lui." Arrived in England, he is commissioned to buy tickets in the public lottery. They all come up blanks. And the young philosopher of twenty-one thus consoles his father who was evidently a hardened gambler,—"All our visionary plans of grandeur are disappointed, the dream of those who had the ten thousand pounds will last a little, but perhaps not much, longer." Meeting the son—"a little odd cur" of a Doctor Maty, whom Johnson called "a little black dog"; a man whom Gibbon despised—he tells his father that he "tipped the boy with a crown, and the father with a coal of fire."

At twenty-one, the young gentleman begins to be a man about town in the best society of London. He is introduced to the famous Lady Harvey's Assembly, "where ('t is true though wonderful) there is no card-playing, but very good company and very good conversation." There he is to meet "the great David Hume." Here is a portentously solid apophthegm for a youth of fashion:—"My unfashionable politics are that a war can hardly be a good one, and a peace hardly a bad one." What a curious folly was the mania for saving the postage of letters by the begging of Franks. "I have got four dozen of Franks for you

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from Sir G. Napier, which I shall send you by the waggon." It had come to be a sign of gentility, never to pay for a letter, but to worry your acquaintances in Parliament in order to evade the tax, which fell upon the common people. At twenty-six he goes again to Paris where he is delighted, and much prefers to London society. "Much less play, more conversation, and instead of our immense routs, agreable [*sic*] societies where you know and are known by almost everybody you meet." He is struck with the French respect for the English character. "The name of Englishman inspires as great an idea at Paris as that of Roman could at Carthage, after the defeat of Hannibal." . . . —"We are now looked on as a nation of philosophers and patriots."

At the age of twenty-six, we seem to catch the first germ of his life-long work. He writes from Lausanne in May, 1763 (thirteen years before the appearance of his first volume),—"I am busy upon the ancient Geography of Italy *and the reviewing my Roman history and antiquities.*" A little later he is engaged upon "a considerable work" —"a description of the ancient Geography of Italy taken from the original authors." He sees Voltaire, at seventy, "act a Tartar Conqueror with a hollow, broken voice, and making love to a very ugly niece of about fifty." But he is amazed at the veteran's energy. "Show me, in history or fable, a famous poet of Seventy who has acted in his own plays, and has closed the scene with a supper and ball for a hundred people." A year passes and he still has his great task in view— "I have never lost sight of the undertaking I laid the foundations of at Lausanne, and I do not despair of being able *one day to produce something by way of a description of ancient Italy, which may be of some use to the publick*, and of some credit to myself." (Letter 37. June, 1764.)

But if the historian of ancient Rome was already a great scholar, he had a curiously wrong judgment as to Mediæval things. "Of all the towns in Italy, I am the least satisfied with Venice; objects which are only singular without being pleasing produce a momentary surprize which soon gives way to satiety and disgust. Old and in general ill built houses, ruined pictures, and stinking ditches dignified with the pompous denomination of canals, a fine bridge spoilt by two Rows of houses upon it, and a large square decorated with the worst Architecture I ever yet saw." And this is Venice! Shades of Byron, Rogers, Shelley, and George Sand! It needed a hundred years before Ruskin could proclaim the glory of these "ill built houses," "ruined pictures," and the "worst Architecture" ever seen. Well! they did n't know

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

everything down in the eighteenth century. We learn that the "grand tour" of a young gentleman who frequented courts, embassies, and the best society abroad, cost him about £700 per annum in the middle of the last century; and the young Gibbon who was careful and did not gamble, but travelled rather *en seigneur* with a valet, plumes himself on spending only £150 in ten weeks.

Gibbon's remarks on public affairs, though never profound or serious, are worthy of note. The Royal Marriage Act (12 Geo: iii, c. 11) —"this most odious law will be forced on Parliament. I do not remember ever to have seen so general a concurrence of all ranks, parties, and professions of men. Administration themselves are the reluctant executioners, but the King will be obeyed, and the bill is universally considered as his, reduced into legal or rather illegal form by Lord Mansfield and the Chancellor." In 1772, before the American Independence, George III was really a king, not unlike his descendant Wilhelm of Prussia to-day. All Gibbon tells us of the partition of Poland in 1772 is, that he will "back Austria against the aged Horse" —(*i. e.* Frederick the Great). Ah! short-sighted historian of Rome, how little did you understand the greatest of your contemporaries!

As is well known, Gibbon was steadily against the independence of the United States, until his good sense convinced him of the folly of continuing the struggle. At first he is sure "that with firmness, all may go well." "Returned this moment from an American debate. A Remonstrance and Representation from the Assembly of New York, presented and feebly introduced by Burke, but most forcibly supported by Fox . . . . The House tired and languid. In this season and on America, the Archangel Gabriel would not be heard. On Thursday an attempt to repeal the Quebec Bill [for the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion], and then to the right about, and for myself, having supported the British, I must destroy the Roman Empire." To Edward Gibbon what were George Washington or George III compared with Belisarius and Justinian? In May, 1775,—"this looks serious, and is indeed so. . . . unless the *Insurgents* are determined to hasten a famine, they must have returned to their own habitations!" Oh! profound historian, these "insurgents" were not Sicilians or Syrians but Anglo-Saxons of the old blood! June, 1775,—"I have not courage to write about America. We talk familiarly of Civil War, Dissolutions of Parliament, Impeachments, and Lord Chatham. The boldest tremble, the most vigorous talk of peace." (31, Oct: 1775.) "The conquest of America is a *great* work: every part of that Continent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is either lost or useless." "What a wretched piece of work do we seem to be making of it in America!" "They have almost lost the appellation of *Rebels*." How drolly this sounds after a hundred and twenty years! "Unless Howe has success we shall be less unanimous for the design of conquering America!" At last Gibbon gives in (Dec: 16, 1777)—"What will be the resolution of our Governors I know not, but I shall scarcely give my consent to exhaust still further the finest country in the World in the prosecution of a war from whence *no reasonable man entertains any hopes of success*. It is better to be humbled than ruined." Sensible—but not heroic. The historian who could so well describe a hero, had little of the hero in himself—"Half my acquaintance," he says, "are running down to Bath for the holydays." Nero fiddled whilst Rome was burning: Gibbon concocted epigrams and friendly letters whilst a British army of 10,000 men was surrendering to "*rebels*"! It was all over by Feb., 1778. "Lord N. [orth] does not deserve pardon for the past, applause for the present, or confidence for the future." To his friend Holroyd he writes—"You will see that America is not *yet* conquered . . . . there seems to be a universal desire of peace even on the most humble conditions. Are you still fierce?" And Gibbon voted with Fox against the Government on his motion to refuse more troops to go to America in Feb., 1778. Fox, Burke, and Chatham honestly condemned Lord North and the American war on just and patriotic grounds. Gibbon supported and approved of the war, till he lost heart, and thought he had better get on with the sack of Rome by the barbarians. Never was able man less of a hero, less of a patriot, less of a statesman.

As to the French Revolution Gibbon, as we always knew, was uniformly hostile and wrong-headed. "Burke's book is a most admirable medicine against the French disease." "The strange Revolution which has humbled all that was high, and exalted all that was low, in France." "Burke is a most eloquent and rational madman." Lord Sheffield says, "every one asks—is Fox mad?" We now learn that the king fell into Homeric laughter over a pleasantry of Gibbon's that the French Revolution reminded him of a childish caricature in which a hog was shown roasting a cook! But Lord Sheffield, who, with his daughter, outdid Gibbon in violent abuse of the "Gallic wolves on the prowl," the "Gallic dogs," and the "French disease infecting other countries," himself published most of the historian's tirades against a movement which he wholly misconceived; and thus we have little new to learn on this head from Gibbon's own letters,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though much that is significant from the unpublished letters of Lord Sheffield himself and of his brilliant daughter, Maria Holroyd. They show how the great movement in France, even before the Terror and the Guillotine, had roused the British aristocracy to real passion.

In small things and in great the familiar notes of the historian are curious reading, now strangely blind, now remarkably sagacious and detached. "Blessings on the man (his name is now buried in oblivion) who first invented the loud trumpet of Advertisements." The trumpet is now of stunning volume, and too often brays us deaf; and opinions to-day are divided whether they are a blessing or a nuisance. We are taken into the library in Bentinck Street where the early part of the great history was composed—"the paper of the Room will be a fine shag flock paper, light blue with a gold border, the Book-cases painted white, ornamented with a light frize [*sic*]; neither Doric nor Dentulated (that was yours) Adamic." It is "my own new clean comfortable dear house"—"I now live, which I never did before, *and if it would but rain*, should enjoy that unity of study and society, in which I have always placed my prospect of happiness." "I have never formed any great schemes of avarice, ambition, or vanity: and all the notions I ever formed of a London life in my own house, and surrounded by my books, with a due mixture of study and society, are fully realised." An omnivorous reader—an unwearied student—but no recluse—no puritan!

From this lettered ease, Gibbon was torn by the unexpected offer of a seat in Parliament, and ultimately by the office of a Lord of Trade —"an event which changes the whole colour of my future life." He was elected M.P. for Liskard in his absence. He was but thirty-eight, but he thought himself too old to become an orator. "I have remained silent, and notwithstanding all my efforts chained down to my place by some invisible—unknown invisible power. *Now America and almost Parliament are at an end* [April, 1775] I have *resumed my History* with vigour and adjourned Politicks to next Winter." Gibbon was a scandalously indifferent Senator, and a *fainéant* official: but at least he knew his own weaknesses and impotence as a man of affairs. He came to hate Parliament, which he calls *Pandemonium*. "I am heartily tired of the place"—"this Parliamentary prattle."—"I again descend into the noise and nonsense of the Pandemonium." He fears that his friend may regret being "excluded from that Pandemonium which we have so often cursed so long as you were obliged to attend it." When retired permanently to Lausanne, he still expects to *sell* his seat

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and talks of "the little but precious stock *which I had so foolishly embarked in the Parliamentary bottom.*" So that a seat in Parliament was a mere investment, which he proposed to sell to the highest bidder! And his Lordship of Trade, or any other minor office which he could fill without trouble, was a mere convenient escape from pecuniary embarrassment. Naturally such a man "shuddered at Grey's motion" [for Parliamentary Reform], and thought that "such men as Grey, Sheridan, Erskine, have talents for mischief." We cannot wonder at the origin and issue of the struggle with America when we see that men like Edward Gibbon were the Members and Ministers whom Lord North could select. And yet Edward Gibbon was a man of learning, sagacity, and honour, not a whit worse than his colleagues, who all clung to the principles of Pitt and Burke.

Amongst the smaller points in the Letters may be noted the startling prevalence of disease. People in full health and youth are continually dying of measles, fevers, small-pox, and apoplexy. Small-pox is as common as influenza to-day, and is treated as one of the familiar nuisances of life, so that patients who recover are congratulated on being safe from a second attack—at any rate for many years. As to the gout, it comes and goes like a common catarrh. Gibbon himself is crippled by it every half year or so; and he talks of paying up his "gout-tax" with a solemn and somewhat awkward humour. How he lived at all with such a constitution is a mystery. It is even a greater mystery how he worked so voraciously to the age of fifty-six. Gibbon did not drink, and he was not a glutton—in days when all Englishmen ate and drank like brutes, when Pitt could not speak without a bottle or two of port, and Sheridan was picked up from the gutter by the watchman, whom he told he was Wilberforce. But it is plain that Gibbon liked a good vintage and an elegant dinner. His plaintive appeals to his friend to send him out to Lausanne some old Madeira—"he trembles for his Madeira"—his despair when he runs short of the generous fluid—are droll enough to us: there was nothing to laugh at in his own day. An English gentleman of that age regarded "the laying down" of a cellar of old wine as a duty that he owed to his country and his order. Some of the historic Madeira still remains: and the present Lord Sheffield delights to give a friend a glass of that most precious ambrosia which sent the blood coursing in the veins of the historian of Elagabalus and Attila.

The great scholar led a pleasant life in London—in August "a delicious solitude"—"I lead the true life of a Philosopher, which con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sists in doing what I really like, without any regard to the world or to fashion." "A few friends and a great many books may entertain me, but I think fifteen hundred people the worst company in the world." His friend's cook was taken with religious mania—which they then called "fanaticism"—"That furious principle which has sometimes overturned Nations has in this instance been contented with unsettling the reason of a Cook." Religious enthusiasm seems to be almost the only thing which really rouses the philosopher's indignation. He has no high opinion of Trial by Jury—"Out of twelve jurymen, I suppose six to be incapable of understanding the question, three afraid of giving offence, and two more who will not take the trouble of thinking. Remains one who has sense, courage, and application." His step-mother and his friends proposed marriage to him, and he allowed them to play about the idea. As to one suggested alliance, he feels scruples about the *religion* of the lady. He will not submit to sermons and family prayers—"I would not marry an Empress on those conditions." He does not believe in marriage. "Sir Stanier and Lady Porter exhibit a very pretty picture of conjugal fondness and felicity, and yet they have been married very near three weeks."

The "grand style" of the "Decline and Fall" was evidently part of Gibbon's nature. His most hasty and familiar confidences are continually dropping into it unconsciously. At times he amuses himself by openly burlesquing it himself. "I think that, through the dark and doubtful mist of futurity [this sonorous exordium has nothing to do with the fall of Empires, or the rise of new religions] I can discern some faint probability that the Gibbon and his Aunt will arrive at Sheffield Place, before the Sun, or rather the Earth, has accomplished eight diurnal Revolutions." To Lady Sheffield he writes—"Inconstant pusillanimous Woman! Is it possible that you should so soon have forgot your solemn vows and engagements, and that you should *pretend* to prefer the dirt and darkness of the Weald of Sussex to the splendid and social life of London?"—One thinks he went to bed in ruffles, and rose to a march performed by the band of the Guards. "The supplies for the journey [a trip to Paris] will be paid by the Roman Empire." The Roman Empire could well bear the strain even of the pomp of its historian. "After decking myself out with silks and silver, the ordinary establishment of Coach, Lodgeing [*sic.*], Servants, eating, and pocket expences does not exceed sixty pounds pr. month. Yet I have two footmen in handsome liveries behind my Coach, and my apartment is hung with damask."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here is his day in Paris. "I am just now going (nine o'clock) to the King's Library, where I shall stay till twelve. As soon as I am dressed I set out to dine with the Duke de Nivernois, shall go from thence to the French Comedy into the Princess de Beauvan's *loge grillée*, and am not quite determined whether I shall sup at Madame du Deffand's, Madame Necker's, or the Sardinian Embassadress's. Do not be fond of shewing my letter; the playful effusions of friendship would be construed by strangers as gross vanity." The brilliant society of France danced and supped on the crater of the volcano. And the courtly historian, whom it welcomed with open arms, could obviously unbend from his philosophic "solitude" when the humour seized him. He has even more famous society in London. "This moment Beauclerck, Lord Ossory, Sheridan, Garrick, Burke, Charles Fox, and Lord Cambden (no bad set you will perhaps say) have left me." Gibbon knew almost all the famous men and women of his age—but with one notable exception. Samuel Johnson disliked Gibbon as an infidel and a prig. Gibbon disliked Johnson as a fanatic and a bear. Both were right as well as wrong. No two men could be more unlike, or less indulgent to each other's failings.

In practical affairs of life Gibbon is eminently sensible, cool, and just. Here is a capital letter to his fiery friend, Lord Sheffield, who apparently wanted to measure swords with a gallant officer.—"I have seen the General. You are both wrong: he first in lending you papers without *special* leave; you in the serious anger you expressed on so trifling a business. Unless you wish that this slight scratch should inflame into an incurable sore, embrace the lucky opportunity of his illness and confinement, which will excuse your dignity and shall assuage your resentment. Call on him this evening, give and receive between jest and earnest, a volley of *damns*, and then let the whole affair be no more remembered than it deserves. *Dixi et liberavi animam meam.*" His advice to Lord Sheffield as to his parliamentary election is thoroughly wise and practical. He had the *mens sana in corpore insano!* "Next Wednesday I conclude my forty-fifth year, and in spite of the changes of Kings and Ministers [he might have added of the Royal visitations of King-Gout] I am very glad that I was born." "I am now seated in my library before a good fire, and among three or four thousand of my old acquaintance." Lausanne, to which he retreats, is "in the most beautiful situation in the world. I shall exchange the most unwholesome air (that of the house of Commons) for the purest and most salubrious, the heat and hurry of party

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for a cool litterary repose." Yet this "step is dictated by the hard law of œconomy or rather of necessity." He had been ruined by his father's extravagance; his embarrassments were incessant; he had lost his seat in Parliament, his office, his public career, and at last he had been driven by pecuniary difficulties to abandon the brilliant society he loved. Yet Lausanne seems to him a Paradise. Never was there such an optimist. He can even write kindly "of the decline and fall of his old Enemy—not the Devil—but the Gout."

His enormous erudition—his passion for books, his historic imagination—these things were the real Gibbon—his airs of a dandy, of a *bon vivant*, of an *esprit fort*, were merely the accidents into which he was born. Now and then he had toyed with the idea of marriage. He had seen a young lady "with very tolerable eyes," good sense, and good humour. But he was himself *indifferent*, and she was *poor*. Another was religious, and he "abhors a devotee, though a friend to decency and toleration." He sought and admired many women; but they never could stir him to surrender his liberty. "The habits of female conversation have sometimes tempted me to acquire the piece of furniture, a wife; and could I unite in a single Woman, the virtues and accomplishments of half a dozen of my acquaintance, I would instantly pay my addresses to the Constellation. [A man only perceives "the bright particular star" when he is already in love: before love the very thought of the stars drives out love.] In the meantime I must content myself with my other wife, the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, which I prosecute with pleasant and constant industry."

But though Edward Gibbon was as insensible as ever man was to the love which leads to marriage, he had two fine passions in his nature —the love of his books and the love of his friends. His intimacy with Deyverdun, the Severys, the Neckers, was a type of romantic attachment between persons of different nations; his affection for Reynolds, Garrick, and Fox does him honour. But the brotherly terms on which he lived with the Holroyds rises to the height of one of those historic friendships which will one day adorn a new treatise "De Amicitia." One cannot read these intimate outpourings of confidence between Gibbon and the first Lord Sheffield—a correspondence maintained unbroken for thirty years—without being struck with this fine example of friendship between two men so curiously unlike, and yet so perfectly sympathetic. It was the union, Gibbon wrote, of "the lion and the lamb, the eagle and the worm." Holroyd is all fire, energy, business capacity, ambition, governing power. Gibbon is placid, indolent, un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practical, and unaspiring. Holroyd does everything for his friend: is his agent, banker, his host, his patron, and his counsellor. Never had helpless student a more vigorous and devoted man of the world to extricate him from all his troubles. Never did an ambitious statesman, with a thousand cares on his shoulders, fling himself more assiduously to rescue and comfort an embarrassed philosopher. One is struck as much with the self-devotion of the peer to his friend as by his many-sided capacity and his indomitable energy. As Gibbon declares in his grand way, "Alexander may sleep, if Parmenio is awake."

Nor is Gibbon's beautiful confidence in his friend, his affection for him, for his wife, and his daughters, less memorable in the record of literary friendships. To him Lady Sheffield is "my dearest My Lady, whom I have now loved as a sister for something better or worse than twenty years" . . . "he has a memory, a conscience, a heart, and that heart is sincerely devoted to Lady S." The fine letters that he wrote to the husband on the death of the wife have been already published. It was on receipt of the sad news of his friend's loss that the historian set out from Lausanne to console him. And the long and difficult journey undoubtedly increased the fatal complaint from which he had long been suffering. For the eldest daughter of the Sheffields, Gibbon had the highest admiration and affection—"that fine diamond," "indeed a most extraordinary young woman," who united "the strong sense of a man with the easy elegance of a female." She was indeed an extraordinary woman, and justified the historian's deep interest in her education. And now at last, by the wise decision of this lady's nephew, the present Earl of Sheffield, the world is permitted to know how much the reputation of Gibbon has owed her, and how closely the memory of her own family is entwined with that of the illustrious historian of Rome.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT ARE NORMAL TIMES?

In all parts of the country people are talking about the restoration of normal times in the business world. There is general discontent with existing conditions, a general belief that these conditions are unnatural and therefore temporary, and that something is going to happen that will bring about a speedy change. It may be well to inquire what the normal times are for which people are longing, and whether there is any reasonable prospect that we shall see such times again.

The popular conception of wholesome and natural conditions in the domain of industry, commerce, and finance must be based upon some standard of comparison in the past. People must be looking back to some epoch within their own recollections when times were good; and it must be because the present times fall far short of that standard that there is such widespread dissatisfaction and such a longing for change. Now is it not true that the comparison in almost every man's mind is made between the present times and the era of prodigious national development which followed the resumption of specie payments in 1879? From 1861 to 1879 the prevalent conditions in the United States could not be regarded as normal and permanent. We were then engaged in making war, or in repairing the enormous waste of the war in life and property; and we were working under an inflated and irredeemable paper currency which imparted fictitious values to many forms of property and to most kinds of labor.

Few memories are long enough to go back to the conditions of business which prevailed from 1850 to 1860; and those who can recollect thus far will certainly not be able to recall a state of affairs which they would desire to see restored. At that time we had an abominable currency system, composed of State-bank issues of fluctuating value and often of no value at all, which entailed great losses upon the producing classes. The transportation system of the country was in a rudimentary state; and the exchange of products was burdened with very heavy charges. It cost then about four times as much as it costs now to get a bushel of wheat from the Mississippi Valley to the seaboard. We shall not, therefore, find a just standard of comparison in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the decade before the war, or in any decade in the earlier history of the Republic. Unfortunately there seems to be no way for the public mind to institute a comparison and to judge of the condition of general business at the present time, except to go back to that wonderful period of rapid progress and general expansion which lasted until about 1890 and came to a dead stop in the panic of 1893.

Would it not be wise to inquire whether those years constituted normal times, and whether we have any reason for expecting that the conditions then prevailing will be restored, either by legislation on the tariff or the currency, or through the country, under the action of world-wide economic laws, gradually lifting itself out of the rut of depression? During the eleven years between 1879 and 1890 this country ran an almost breathless race of eager and rapid development. We constructed more than 88,000 miles of railroad. We transferred more than 2,000,000 people from the densely settled portions of the country to the Mississippi Valley, to the plains beyond, and to the Pacific Coast. This displacement of population opened improved opportunities to the laboring classes remaining in the East. At the same time we brought from Europe about 1,000,000 emigrants; planting them mainly in the old and new West. We built up new cities, and added greatly to the population of the old ones. We created thousands of new villages and towns. We opened hundreds of thousands of new farms on the Western prairies. We established a multitude of new manufacturing concerns, to supply the enormous demand for railway and building material, for machinery and implements of all kinds, and for the innumerable articles of comfort and luxury required in the hundreds of thousands of new homes and new places of business. To do all this we borrowed vast sums of money. We drew upon the accumulations of our Eastern communities, and obtained from Europe, in the aggregate, probably not less than $2,000,000,000. We created six new States in the Far West, and made immense additions to the population of the older, but still young, States in that region.

Certainly those were not normal times. On the contrary, they were very abnormal times. They were based upon conditions that will never be seen again upon the American continent. To long for their restoration is to indulge in the fascinating but profitless occupation of chasing rainbows. We have no longer any vast areas of fertile land, with sufficient rainfall for agriculture, upon which we can build up great farming communities, with towns and cities and thousands of miles of new railroads. I have shown in previous articles in THE FORUM that settle-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment during the boom period went out on the great plains beyond the line of sufficient rainfall and was obliged to draw back; leaving abandoned homes and shrivelled towns behind it. I have shown that further development of agriculture in the Far West must depend largely upon irrigation works, which require large capital, engineering skill, and years of time to bring into operation. I by no means maintain that the progress of the West has ceased; but I insist that future advance in that region must be a matter of the steady filling up of the good lands in States already fairly well settled, and of irrigation enterprises which can be carried on successfully only when money is obtainable at low rates of interest.

The primary condition of our great epoch of national growth was the rapid peopling of the new West. This it was that made such an active demand for a great variety of raw materials and manufactured products. It was this, too, which gave to the whole nation a buoyant, enterprising, and speculative tone. The farmer or mechanic who was plodding along in the older communities of the country was almost sure of improving his condition if he went West. The small storekeeper in the East became a large merchant in the new Western city. The lawyer without clients and the doctor without patients went West, to find an encouraging field for their talents. There was not only an enormous farming development, but there was an immense development of mining resources in gold, silver, copper, lead, and iron. The transportation service of the new West opened a career to tens of thousands of energetic young men. Money-making was rather an easy matter to anyone possessed of shrewdness and the acquisitive spirit. Fortunes were quickly made in converting prairie acres into town lots, in the opening of gold- and silver- iron- and coal-mines, in exploiting the pine- and fir-forests, in establishing new factories, and in the promotion of railway building. To that Golden Age we might well apply Shakespeare's words,

> "And should I live a thousand years I never could forget it."

Now what is there in our present condition or in our future prospects to justify the hope that those times will return? Our new West is already fairly well peopled; and its business conditions have conformed themselves to those of the rest of the country. Except in a few mining districts, it no longer offers a field for adventure or speculation. Our great transcontinental railway systems are already constructed; and not one of them can earn interest on the money it cost.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our new towns and cities went rather beyond the capacity of the tributary country to support them, under the stimulus of inflated real-estate values and with the temporary opportunities they offered for employment of labor. We shall not again have a flood of foreign money pouring in, to loan upon anything or everything having the semblance of property. The foreigner has had his experience; and he now wants to be doubly sure that he is going to get his capital back and his regular interest payments, before an American investment has any attraction for him. Is it not on the whole probable that we shall have to make up our minds to plod along in the slow-going way of older nations, and to be satisfied with moderate profits and a slow accumulation of wealth? If these be our reasonable expectations, would it not be sane and wholesome for people to cease dreaming of a Golden Age which is gone forever?

There are other circumstances which tend to sickly o'er the rosy dreams of easy money-making and of a feverish activity in all departments of business, in which so many people are indulging. We have been steadily, but inevitably, forced out of our old conditions of exceptional well-being, which came from our possession of a virgin continent, and have been brought into the competitive struggle in which all other civilized nations are engaged. We have our special advantages, and must make the most of them; but we are no longer a country exceptional and apart, easily maintaining higher standards of living than those which prevail elsewhere, supplying largely our own needs, and selling the excess of our natural products in markets practically controlled by ourselves. Our great staples of wheat, cotton, and petroleum meet with sharp competition from the products of fields and wells in other lands. In a word, we are in the great world-struggle for existence. We must adopt the close economies practised by other nations, and must depend upon our superior energy and skill, and our genius for inventing and running machinery, to hold our own in the struggle.

I think that we shall unquestionably witness a steady improvement in business conditions in the immediate future. We have just escaped a great danger. So long as the menace of lowering the money standard was hanging over us it was impossible for business to get into anything like a normal condition. People do not put out their money willingly when there is any uncertainty as to the kind of money they are going to get back. Some lines of business will no doubt be aided by new tariff measures; but it will be a mistake to expect too much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from that quarter. Nothing magical is going to result from a new tariff bill.

The danger ahead, which thoughtful men now see, is that there will be widespread disappointment at the failure of the old boom times to come back again, and that this disappointment will show itself again in political agitation. Unfortunately we still have some millions of voters who imagine that the Government can and ought to put money in their pockets; that by some contrivance of law-making it can make farm products higher, wages better, and labor more fully employed. Times may be a great deal better than they are now and yet the prevalent discontent may continue; and undoubtedly in that case either we shall see a revival of the irrational and injurious free-silver agitation or there will come up out of the depths of ignorance and unrest a new paper-money craze. It will be wisdom on the part of men who can reach public opinion through the press and from the platform to take up and discuss the question of what normal times really are, and thus, perhaps, prevent another wild rush toward ruin like that from which we have just safely emerged,—almost by the skin of our teeth.

If the McKinley Administration succeeds in getting its tariff and currency policy adopted by the new Congress, the new measures will hardly have time to demonstrate their wisdom before the Congressional election of 1898. We know that the present expectations, entertained by a multitude of voters, of the possibility of good times growing out of a change in the Government are not likely to be realized, because the times for which they long can never be restored. We may be doing fairly well in all our main lines of business activity, in farming, in manufacturing, and in transportation, but the prevailing discontent may not be cured. If it shall not be greatly modified by educational influences, a House of Representatives hostile to the sound financial policy of the Administration will be elected; and we shall then find ourselves on the flood-tide of another cheap-money agitation,—to culminate in another sharp struggle at the Presidential election in 1900, with renewed disturbance of business, the unsettlement of all values, and the peril of a great catastrophe. There is no better way of averting these threatened misfortunes than to continue, through the conservative press of the country,—the newspapers, the magazines, and the reviews,—the excellent educational work on financial questions which saved the country from disaster in the recent campaign.

EUGENE V. SMALLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS ENGLAND'S INDUSTRIAL SUPREMACY A MYTH?

In June last the Cobden Club celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the repeal of the corn laws by a jubilee banquet and the presentation of a congratulatory address to the Right Hon. Charles Villiers, M. P.,—sole survivor of the great quadrumvirate who led the remarkable agitation that finally triumphed in 1846. The anniversary milestoned an event which has exerted a more profound influence upon the world's economic development than any other series of fiscal laws. The principle of free trade, as applied by Great Britain under the circumstances which then existed in that country and in her international trade, has been abundantly vindicated by events. It has consequently followed that the notion has since dominated the English mind, that necessarily, in all conditions, in all countries, at all stages of industrial development, free trade is the only logical, tenable, and defensible economic policy of the state. The teachings of the Manchester school have enormously influenced the economic thinking and writing of the scholastic world. Nevertheless they have not influenced in the slightest degree the fiscal legislation of other nations. The rest of the world remains more rigidly protective in policy than at any time during these fifty years, and shows no sign either of wavering in allegiance or of suffering in consequence. The Cobden Club has affected to marvel at this world-blindness, and to deplore its consequences to the nations which are its victims. Never, until this jubilee meeting, has it occurred to its members that the lapse of time, whatever it may have established in the case of England for the doctrines of Adam Smith and Richard Cobden, has not less triumphantly vindicated the economic teachings of the well-nigh forgotten Friedrich List. It is opportune, therefore, to compare the results of fifty years of List's economic principles, as illustrated in the industrial development of Germany, with the fruits of fifty years of Cobdenism in England.

Singularly enough this comparison is unconsciously suggested by the remarkable speech of Mr. Leonard Courtney, M. P., who occupied the chair at the Cobden Club jubilee. The burden of that speech was the coming decline of England's commercial prestige; and its key-note

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is contained in his remark, "If the catastrophe comes, it will be in spite of the free-trade principle; it could not be the result of it. . . . The office of free trade will be to mitigate that which it is not within its power to avert." Thus the exuberance of this jubilee occasion was tempered by the presence of the skeleton at the feast. For, when the Cobden Club admits that the decline of England's industrial and commercial supremacy is at hand, we need no longer hesitate to accept at their full significance the declarations, demonstrations, and lamentations to the same effect which have so persistently obtruded themselves into all recent discussions of this question in Great Britain. We may discount the Cassandrine utterances of the "fair-trade" propaganda, but we cannot blink the recent declaration of Lord Rosebery, that Great Britain is no longer the undisputed mistress of the world of commerce, and that the decline in her export trade is due to the alarming increase in that of her Continental rivals. The ex-premier fortified his statement by the skilful analysis of the Board-of-Trade returns made in Mr. Williams's book,[1]—one of the most notable publications of the year. "The industrial supremacy of England has long been an axiomatic commonplace," says Mr. Williams, in his opening sentence; "it is fast turning into a myth." When the former premier joins the presiding officer of the Cobden Club in certifying to the general correctness of Mr. Williams's diagnosis, further argument is superfluous.

But the statistical aspects of the question have recently been grouped so tersely and graphically by Lord Masham, the great worsted manufacturer of Bradford (better known in this country as Samuel Cunliffe-Lister, the founder of the Manningham mills), that we can here reproduce his summary without overdosing the reader with figures.

ENGLAND'S BALANCE SHEET FOR TWENTY YEARS.

	1874.	1884.	1894.	1894 over 1874.
Agricultural Imports....	£41,117,187	£59,357,167	£77,438,130	Increase 88.3%
Manufactured Imports..	70,897,391	81,490,963	104,489,699	Increase 47.3%
Manufactured Exports...	202,254,531	186,800,386	157,744,241	Decrease 22%
Coal, Machinery, etc....	19,382,321	21,809,235	30,945,199	Increase 59.6%
Population	32,501,517	35,724,231	38,786,053	Increase 19.5%
Imports retained for Home Manufacture...	89,143,995	79,421,719	64,369,715	Decrease 27.8%
Export Trade to British Possessions, 1890–4 over 1870–4				Increase 29.9%
Export Trade to Foreign Countries,	do.	do.		Decrease 10.6%

[1] "Made in Germany." By ERNEST EDWIN WILLIAMS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lord Masham holds this table to embody conclusive evidence of England's industrial dry-rot. He makes it the basis of a passionate appeal in behalf of Mr. Chamberlain's scheme for an imperial trade federation or zollverein. The English export trade to foreign countries has decreased from an average value of 175 million pounds sterling for the five-year period ending 1874 to an average value of 155 million pounds sterling for the five-year period ending 1894,—a loss of over 11 per cent; while the exports to the British colonial possessions have risen from an average of 60 millions to an average of 78 millions, —an increase of 30 per cent; the net result being an actual loss, though a small one, in the total export trade, during the twenty-year period.

Lord Masham would conserve and increase the colonial trade by differential duties; but Mr. Courtney castigates Mr. Chamberlain for daring to suggest the reproduction, within the empire, of the salient features of the policy that prevailed within the kingdom prior to 1846. So that, while the doctrinaires are agreed in the diagnosis of the disease, they remain at loggerheads as to the remedy. The "fair-traders" have at least this advantage over their opponents: they have a specific remedy to suggest. The latter are hopelessly without any.

The significance of Lord Masham's figures can be grasped only by a study of the minute analysis made in Mr. Williams's book. To take some of the more striking items: English exports of iron and steel have declined from £31,190,256 in 1874 to £18,688,763 in 1894; of hardware and cutlery, from £4,403,399 to £1,834,481; of linen, from £8,832,533 to £5,443,860; of woollens, from £28,359,512 to £18,728,-946; of cottons, from £74,247,625 to £66,554,529. The effect of the last reduction is seen to-day in the wide-spread paralysis of the manufacturing districts of Lancashire, where the mills of the joint-stock companies stand idle by the score.

It is true that some considerable measure of the decline in the value of these exports is represented by the falling prices of recent years; but the returns by quantity tell much the same story; and the fact remains that in every branch of manufactures where the English exports show a decline, those of Germany exhibit an increase, and generally a large increase. What is true of Germany in this respect is true of all the manufacturing nations of western Europe.

Side by side with this decrease in English exports has come a large increase in the imports of manufactured articles into England; as, for instance, in woollens, where the imports have grown from £5,600,194 in 1874 to £11,464,015 in 1894. The total increase in manufactured

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imports is from £70,897,391 in 1874 to £104,489,699 in 1894; and this is confined almost exclusively to articles which England made better and cheaper than any of her competitors could make them in the years immediately following the repeal of the corn laws. It will be noticed that the total value of manufactured articles imported into England is greater than the value of similar imports into the United States.

Mr. Swire Smith, a distinguished Yorkshire manufacturer who remains true to the doctrine of free trade, draws, in one of his recent addresses, an almost pathetic picture of the effects of Continental competition. He says:—

> "On every shop counter where our goods are sold, we have to overcome the low wages and long hours of all our competitors, and also the high tariffs which even our own colonies have erected against us. There are none who can really appreciate the severity of the struggle but those who are in it. It grows keener every year; and old firms who, in prosperous times, built up great establishments, and enriched the country by their energies, have dropped out of the race, their capital exhausted, while their workpeople have been compelled to suffer with them. These are some of the incidents which show how merciless is the warfare of commerce; and, unfortunately, the painful confession has to be made, that in many industries we are losing ground, and not gaining."

Machinery is the single item of manufactures in which English exports show an increase during these twenty years. The ominous portent of this increase is brought out by Mr. Smith. He was one of the members of the Royal Commission on Technical Education, appointed in 1880; and he declares, in the address already quoted, that it seemed to the members of that Commission, as they travelled from factory to factory on the Continent, "as if half our people at home are engaged in making weapons to be used abroad against the other half." Even in machinery the Germans have latterly discovered that they can make a better article than the English; while, in the iron and steel industries generally, the English no longer dispute German supremacy. In 1894, the English Iron Trade Association sent a deputation to Germany and Belgium to discover, on the spot, the reasons why those countries were extending their export trade in iron and steel so much more rapidly than England. The report of this deputation emphasized the superior character of the machinery and labor-saving appliances found in the German and Belgian foundries; showing a remarkable advance as compared with the best-appointed works in the Midlands. It attributed this advance and others to the great attention paid to technical education during the last half-century; and concluded with the announcement that German superiority rests upon its merits, rather than upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any adventitious circumstances. The London "Times," commenting upon this report, remarked that it was fairly to be inferred that "the days of the South Staffordshire iron trade, with the exception perhaps of the sheet-iron branch, are numbered."

Four years prior to this report, the United States had succeeded in wresting from England the place of honor in the iron industry, by producing a larger quantity of pig-iron. On the basis of the statistics of the last ten years, it will not take more than four years longer for Germany to drive England from the second place—into which the United States has forced her—into the third position.

Iron is called the barometer of industry; and it is not necessary to follow the exports of England into other lines to establish the point that her foreign trade is declining,—not rapidly, but none the less surely,—while that of Germany is advancing, and advancing at a more rapid rate than the decline in England. It is an elementary mathematical proposition that, if these processes continue, the time is not far distant when German trade will exceed English trade. Shipping returns are a pretty safe test of commercial prosperity: it is, therefore, significant that in 1893 the total tonnage of the sea-going ships which touched at Hamburg for the first time left Liverpool behind; and in 1894 Hamburg surpassed her record of the previous year.[1]

These facts are the comment of half a century upon the respective economic theories of Cobden and List.

Following faithfully and doggedly in the pathway blazed by Cobden, England, after fifty years of manifest and augmenting advantage, has at length reached a point where the advantage and the disadvantage of that economic policy so nearly balance each other that a partial restoration of the protective policy has come to be regarded as an imperative necessity by one of the leading members of the British government, and perhaps by others, including the present premier; for that is the accusation brought in Mr. Courtney's jubilee address. "Lord Salisbury!" he exclaimed, "you want other nations to believe in free trade: begin by believing in it yourself!" It is not for outsiders to attempt to measure the real sentiment of the English people; but we can at least venture the prediction that the time is coming when the battle which Peel and Cobden fought to a finish in 1846 must be fought over again.

On the other hand, Germany, adopting Friedrich List's economic theory at about the same time that England assented to that of Cob-

[1] "Made in Germany," p. 13.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

den, has seen her consolidated empire emerge, as with seven-league boots, from a position of purely agrarian industry into an industrial development so perfect, so homogeneous, so aggressive, that she can meet and beat her English competitors in any market of the world, not excepting England itself.

Here is an industrial paradox; on its face irreconcilable with economic theory, yet upon analysis perfectly simple and self-explanatory. The contrast presented by the practical operation of the two antagonistic economic theories in these two widely different fields covers the most important and significant chapter in the world's industrial history. It shows that in 1846 Cobden was right for England, and that List was right for Germany. By parity of reasoning, it shows that there is no hard and fast rule, no iron-clad economic law, in the present condition of human development, which predetermines what fiscal policy is necessarily best for every nation at any given time. It will afford curious commentary on the acres of eulogy that have been written about the Manchester doctrine, if, sometime in the future, we shall find England enforcing differential duties within an imperial zollverein, and Germany throwing open her ports to all the world. Yet this is not the least probable of the many strange things which the future may have in store.

Generations of drastic protection had made England, on the advent of Peel, the workshop of the world. A number of causes, some natural, others artificial, had aided in making her the imperial mistress of commerce and industry. Her isolated position exempted her from invasion and home wars, and favored the maritime and commercial instincts of her people. The genius of that people made her the home of modern methods of mechanical manufacturing. She developed the steam-engine and all its indescribable possibilities in the way of cheapening and increasing production. The Arkwright spinning-machinery, the power-loom, the worsted-comb, with their accoutrements, were not only all her own, but had been successfully kept her own, until early in the present century, by laws which forbade and punished the export of either parts or patterns. That Goliath of modern industry, the factory system, was a product of English institutions, enormously stimulated by exhaustless stores of iron and coal.

Never had Providence so favored a nation as England was favored in the last half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries. Industrially, she was a half-century in advance of the rest of the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The problem which occupied her statesmen was how to keep the advantage thus secured. There were certain hindrances which threatened to offset it. Never had there been a nation in so artificial a position. She was living on imported food, and earning it by manufacturing imported raw materials. The tax upon corn and other food products necessarily increased the cost of living, and thus, indirectly, the cost of manufacturing. Her tariff taxes were chiefly imposed upon food supplies, and upon raw materials, nearly all of which, save iron, coal, and wool, it was necessary to import. At the same time she was manufacturing many times in excess of the needs of her own people, with a surplus constantly growing larger. For this surplus new markets must be found and held; which meant that the cost of production must be kept at the lowest possible point.

As we look back through the vista of this half-century, and sense in retrospect the situation as it existed in the days of Cobden and Bright, the marvel is, not that they saw things as they did, but that they should have found it so herculean a task to convince the English people that free trade was the only possible way out for them. We marvel that the landed and agricultural interests should have been strong enough to so long delay it; for the limit of agricultural development had long since been reached, and was pitiably inadequate to the daily wants of the people. On the other hand, no imagination was bold enough to attempt to measure the possibilities of development which lay before the manufacturing interests. Agriculture suffered the full measure of the blow which the repeal of the corn laws inflicted, and suffers from it to-day more keenly than at any earlier epoch; but the nation as a whole gained from that repeal immeasurably more than the farmers and landed interests lost.

The two things necessary to preserve to England what she had gained were obvious. First,—Food and materials must be as cheap with her as with any other nation. Second,—If England was to hold her own outside England, where her markets lay, she must at the same time discipline and equip herself for that struggle by meeting and matching any and every competition on her own soil. Absolute free trade was necessary, not only to permit, but to *compel* England's manufacturers to produce as cheaply as her possible competitors. With a wisdom born of profound selfishness, with that enlightened national spirit which regards home interests before those of any and all other nations, she accepted these conditions.

The results, as Mr. Courtney says, magnificently vindicate the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy of 1846. The export of British and Irish produce increased from £97,000,000 in 1854 (the earliest date supplied by the statistical abstracts of the Board of Trade) to £248,000,000 in 1889, which is the largest year in the series; but one subsequent year (1891) approximating that total. Here is an increase of 150 per cent in thirty-five years of free trade. Other nations, notably the United States, have shown a larger percentage of growth during corresponding years; but the English ratio is substantial enough to justify any encomium that may be lavished upon the economic policy that stands behind it.

No other nation has ever found itself in like circumstances, nor ever will. Therefore, Mr. Courtney has no occasion to marvel that England has not succeeded in luring any other nation along the same primrose path. On the contrary, the challenge of England—for it was nothing else—supplied the strongest of reasons why no nation which hoped to share in her industrial development should accept her guidance. The legislation of 1846 was notice to the rest of the world that England, deeming herself industrially invincible, proposed to reap the rewards of that invincibility. It inevitably drove every would-be competitor to seek refuge, in self-defence, in protection; and thus, in the end, it has proved to be a two-edged sword.

Contemporaneously with English statesmen and economists, Friedrich List had sensed this situation, and thought out its bearing upon the industrial future of Germany. Accepting the abstract theories of international trade announced by Adam Smith, and admitting the economic advantages of free trade as a cosmopolitan policy, he detected and exposed its weakness when applied to the case of an individual nation situated as his own country was. In the cosmopolitan status, where all nations were completely developed industrially, international freedom of trade was the natural and best status for all. But without that equality of conditions, international free trade inevitably meant the further aggrandizement of the nation industrially superior, at the expense of every country that remained incompetent to hold its own against the superior nation. He applied this test to his own country. He saw no permanent gain from German free trade to anyone but England, so long as Germany remained inferior at every point save agriculture; and he announced the great theory of nationalism, *i. e.*, that it is the purpose of a national fiscal policy not simply or chiefly to gain mere matter by exchanging goods for goods, but rather *to gain in productive and political power.*

List was educated to this philosophy by his residence in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States (1825-1830), during which he studied the workings of the protective policy in this country. He saw how rapidly the United States was gaining upon his own country, by reason of a policy which tended directly to the development of industrial independence. To List's efforts chiefly Germany owed her zollverein, the customs association of the German states, which was the cradle of the empire. Internal free trade among the German states led naturally into the correlative policy of protection against the trade encroachments of outside states. English manufactures were everywhere; and industrial headway was uncertain and spasmodic. Thus, during the years that England was agitating for free trade, all the internal conditions favored List's propaganda for protection in Germany; and, during the last half-century, the two fiscal theories have practically paralleled each other in the two countries.

The record of German progress during this half-century is certainly not less impressive than that of England,—from certain points of view it is far more significant. Applying the test already employed for England,—the value of the manufactured exports,—we find that German commerce has increased from £36,000,000 in 1850 to £163,000,000 in 1889; the percentage of increase being 350, as compared with 150 per cent of increase in British commerce. Admitting that these percentages are not a fair test, it must nevertheless be agreed that German progress has been much the faster of the two; and very much faster, when we consider the relative disadvantages under which Germany started in the race. In twenty years Germany had doubled her exports, and lifted herself to a point of vantage equal to that at which England started in 1846. In twenty years more she has attained an industrial development on a par with that of England, in practically every line of manufacturing; in many lines surpassing it. German ambition sets no limit on the progress of the future; for it looks upon the development of the half-century as merely preliminary and preparatory.

If Germany had accepted England's dictum instead of following the teachings of List, she must have remained industrially dependent upon England. As it is, she has become her rival. Some sacrifices she has undoubtedly made to reach that end; some burdens she has borne, of which the advocates of free trade are apt to make very much when arguing the abstract question. Notwithstanding them all, and accepting the utmost dimensions that may be placed upon them, the increase in the wealth and resources of the German nation has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prodigious. List recognized these losses and burdens; but he predicted that they would be recuperated with interest, in the shape of productive force,—a force pregnant with future wealth and prosperity. And his prediction has been overwhelmingly fulfilled.

To this development Great Britain has unwittingly contributed more than all other nations combined. The Germans are apt pupils; and they have improved upon their schoolmaster. England has contributed nothing new to labor-saving machinery that Germany has not promptly adopted. She imported no machines from England, except with the purpose of learning to make them herself. She sent her young men into English factories and counting-rooms; and whatever there was to learn there she appropriated or improved upon. She did not merely imitate. Very early she saw that the hereditary superiority of English workmanship was a prime factor in reducing the cost and increasing the excellence of production. Thereupon she established the most comprehensive system of industrial and technological education to be found anywhere in the world. In the course of time her artisan class has grown conspicuously superior in skill and intelligence to the English workman. Her best brains have been drafted into the work of improving and cheapening the processes of manufacture, through the aid of scientific investigation. In school and college, in factory and laboratory, they have set in motion a system of industrial forces which is working out results with the precision to which years of the most patient preparation have logically led. It is not too much to say that German contributions to the development of the chemical side of manufacturing have been as important as the English contributions to the mechanical side. During all these years that the Cobden Club has been reiterating the glories of the *laisser faire*, and pointing to the wonderful expansion of English trade and manufactures, the Germans have been gaining steadily upon Great Britain; following her first into the world's neutral markets, then into her own colonies, and finally into her own island. Whatever the government itself could do to strengthen and foster this industrial competition, it has done without stint, and with aggressive diplomacy. It has established its commercial agencies on every continent; it has negotiated differential treaties of vast advantage to German manufacturers; it has subsidized transportation routes and industrial schools with equal generosity; it has encouraged new enterprises by every agency which a paternal government can invent. And it has its reward, in this fiftieth year of Cobdenism, in the nearly general admission of British statesmen and man-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ufacturers, that the German can undersell the Englishman to-day, in his own markets, in all great lines of manufacture. It has had its reward too in the fact that while the declared value of English exports (produce and manufactures) to Germany fell from £19,293,636 in 1890 to £17,698,457 in 1893, the value of the exports of Germany to Great Britain has steadily advanced from year to year until in 1893 it reached £21,632,614. An examination of the detailed tables shows that Germany has for many years been selling a much larger quantity of manufactured articles in England than England has sold in Germany. These are, in nearly every instance, articles which England makes at home and exports to other countries. The Germans are underselling the English in England; while the German tariff prevents England from underselling the Germans in Germany.

Undoubtedly the Germans have had other advantages besides their tariff, their energy, industry, ingenuity, and system in this great industrial advance. German manufacturers have thus far escaped many of the impediments which have hampered those of England. Notably they have been exempt from the minute and perplexing restrictions of English factory legislation; and notably also, the relations between employer and employed have been far less troublesome. Trades-unionism exists in Germany; but it is neither so rampant nor so pig-headed as trades-unionism in England. Strikes and wage disputes are comparatively infrequent there, notwithstanding the fact that the hours of labor remain long, while those of England are the shortest of any nation in the world; notwithstanding the fact, also, that German wages are as a rule considerably lower than those of England. Longer hours and lower wages are very material aids in reducing productive costs, and have been of tremendous value to Germany in bringing her abreast of England in the field of international competition. But these are advantages which, in the nature of things, cannot last. Indeed the steady rise of German wages is apparent in all recent investigations. The deputation of the British Iron Trade Association, already alluded to, reported that, contrary to the general belief, German wages in the iron industry were slightly higher in 1895 than those prevailing in Staffordshire and the north of England. It has long been a favorite argument with Englishmen that the shorter hours and higher wages of their country tended to greater efficiency and larger production. We find it difficult to reconcile this contention with the admission, now quite general in England, that the German workman, by reason of his superior technical education, is a better workman than the English-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man. Side by side with this admission is the universal declaration of British manufacturers that the eight-hour day, for which the Trades Union Congress has just reiterated its demand, is the one step now necessary to drive the final nail in the coffin of English industry.

This analysis of two contemporaneous industrial developments establishes the economic fact, admitted by Mr. Courtney,—for the first time in any utterance of the Cobden Club,—that nations may flourish under a protective system and may decline under free trade. Thus is swept away a mass of superfluous and beclouding dogma the partisan and passionate reiteration of which has shut from view the only sound basis from which to approach the consideration of the question. The fiscal policy which is one nation's meat, may be another nation's poison. It is purely a question of national expediency; to be determined, by each nation for itself, in favor of the one policy or the other, or of a combination of some features of both, according to the exigencies of the situation of that nation at a given period. It is not impossible, nor is it altogether improbable, that, before the close of the first half of the twentieth century, we shall see Germany flourishing under free trade, and England renewing her youth under some form of limited protection,—perhaps the industrial zollverein for which Lord Masham pleads and Mr. Chamberlain appears to be ready.

S. N. D. North.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MODERN GREECE.[1]

THE Greece of to-day, forming, as it does, the only living bridge between the past and the present of European history during a period of nearly three thousand years, from Homer down to Rangabé and Bikellas, certainly does not always receive the recognition from intelligent Englishmen which it so eminently deserves. For this there are various causes. First, there may be some persons, brought up in the school of the politicians of the third decade of the present century, who are accustomed to look at Greece only from the side of Turkey, and who, in this regard, consider every loss of territory in that quarter as dangerous to the balance of power in Europe, an incentive to Russian aggression, and perilous to England's commercial movements in the Mediterranean and to her imperial influence in the East. Let Greece perish; but let Turkey stand and hold the keys of Constantinople against the ever-watchful burglars of the North!

This view of the Hellenic question was perhaps pardonable enough at the outbreak of the Greek Liberation war in 1821; and the Emperor Alexander, as a member of the Holy Alliance, was, personally, so far as his motives were concerned, worthy of praise rather than of blame in regarding the revolt against the Turkish yoke as an act of lawless insurrection, which should receive no encouragement from any well-constituted government. But times have changed since then: we know now what the Greeks were who fought that noble battle; and our fathers have seen that merciless sweep of blood and butchery by which the Turks, had they been allowed free scope by the European Powers, would have exterminated the noble people to whom we owe the most valuable part of our spiritual and intellectual heritage. For, though Christianity was born in Judea, it grew up to manhood with the sway of the Greek tongue; and as for intellect, there is not a science of the most recent birth in modern Europe that does not bear the stamp of Greek thought and Greek expression on its forehead. It was not, therefore, a common but a nobly exceptional case which

[1] This article, written toward the end of 1894, was the last from Professor BLACKIE'S pen.—Ed. THE FORUM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

induced the European Powers,—especially England, France, and Russia,—though with a slow and cautious advance, ultimately to proceed to an intervention in favor of the revolted subjects of the Porte in the Morea and adjacent districts of the ancient Hellas. It was the voice of humanity prevailing over the negations of a heartless policy. The wholesale atrocities of the Turks had put them, to use Archibald Alison's words, "beyond the pale of international civilization"; and the laws that regulate the warlike intercourse of nation with nation, and of man with man, were wholly inapplicable to the cry of a noble people, bleeding under the oppression of a Power that could not maintain the right of the stronger without revelling, with the ferocity of the tiger, in the butchery of human shambles. There is, we may say with confidence, at the present moment [1894] not a single human-hearted person in the British dominions who could wish the independence of Greece, established by the interference of the three Allied Powers in 1827, undone for the sake of keeping up a strong Turkey; on the contrary, every person who has studied the details of the patriotic struggle which ended victoriously at Navarino will agree with Alison in describing the "untoward event" or, as the friends of Greece call it, "that happy blunder," as "one of the most glorious events in the annals of Christendom."[1]

Another and a more efficient cause for the scanty acknowledgment of living Greece by British travellers is, that though no man can compare the attractive power of Switzerland, for instance, to that of Greece, the country of *William Tell* is in every way more accessible and more open to the perambulation of strangers than the scene of the exploits of Colokotronis, Canaris, and other prime actors in the drama of the Greek Liberation war. John Bull is a comfortable animal; and even Scotch Sandy, in these days of swift and easy travel, is not so ready to buckle himself to the treading of thorny glens, or the scaling of rocky braes, as he was half a century ago, before the appearance of railways. Travelling nowadays, in the old style known to Ulysses,—where a certain amount of personal skill and daring was necessary to the successful achievement of a tour,—may be said to be extinct: we do not travel; but, as Mr. Ruskin has it, we are *sent*. But even in respect of steam locomotion by railways, Greece is following fast in the track of more favored countries. When the new line shooting northward to Larissa is finished, there will be eight hundred and seventy-five miles—more than twice the distance from Edinburgh to London—in

[1] "History of Europe," by ARCHIBALD ALISON, chap. xiv, p. 159.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

efficient action. Add to this the railway to Patras, which has brought Greece into closer connection with its natural commercial ally, the West of Europe, and the most dainty tourist will understand how easy it is to jump into the train at Patras, and, after an hour or two's rattle, land at Olympia, the great centre of Greek gymnastics and of Greek art.

So much for present facilities of communication; though I must say that, to fix the features of a country permanently in the mind's eye, the old style of travelling—by pedestrian tramp, or quiet jolt on the back of a lazy mule—is the best. But there is another hindrance in the way of a tourist in Greece, which, if it does not check his advance through the most picturesque and the most interesting of all European countries, certainly makes a large deduction from his pleasure. A human-hearted traveller is eager, not only to set foot on the ground which was once the seat of fateful oracles, and the stage of early Christian apostleship, but to speak with the people who, through a thousand years of mediæval struggle, and four hundred years of Turkish oppression, have preserved, in unbroken continuity, the language of Aristotle, of the Apostle Paul, and of Clemens of Alexandria. It was Jean Paul Richter who made the remark, that, as the way to a mother's heart is through her children, so the way to a people's heart is through their mother tongue. This is most true. One kindly "la math dhuit" will do more to win a Sassenach tourist an entrance into a warm Highland heart, than a hundred good-day-to-yous in the best English style. And, though our English travellers are by no means celebrated for their colloquial mastery of European tongues, a modicum of French or German will enable them without much trouble to shake hands and hearts with the "honest men and bonnie lassies" that people the winding glens or the sloping braes of the German and Swiss Alps. But with Greece it is otherwise. German and French, when taught in our schools, are taught as they are understood and used familiarly in the daily intercourse of the people who speak them; but Greek and Latin are taught as dead languages, for the purpose of reading only, wherein the eye usurps the province of the ear; and when the voice asserts its place in the business, as it must do, it is the English orthoepy that is allowed freely to give vocal law to the manly majesty of a Ciceronian sentence, or the rich note of a Platonic period. The absurdity of this insular peculiarity of our English classical teaching, with regard to Latin, was shown some years ago by a well-known Cambridge scholar—Munro; but the pedagogues besouth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Tweed, like the Pope on the banks of the Tiber, still stand on their own Anglified Latin, and mouth it in a fashion that no inheritor of the old language of the Western Church in Italy, France, or Ireland can understand. But if this Anglified trick is bad in Latin, it is doubly bad in Greek; for, if Latin under the influences of the last two centuries may be said to be now a half-dead language, or a language with only an artificially prolonged academical life, Greek is a living language as much now as in the days when Demosthenes rolled his thunder against the Macedonian in the *agora*, or when, four hundred years later, the Apostle Paul on the hill of Mars used the same weapons more effectively against the sneers of the Stoic and Epicurean babblers of his time.

To talk of Greek as a dead language is to show an ignorance of the historical fates of western Asia and southeastern Europe, of which men pretending to culture should be ashamed. How could Greek ever die during the thousand years of the Byzantine Empire, when, from Constantine downward, it had driven Latin from its throne, and asserted its existence, not only in a continuous stream of literary authority in church and state, but in the daily intercourse of all educated persons from Cyprus to Crete, and from Crete to Corfu? Then, from the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, classical Greek stood yet more firmly against the Osmanli dominance than it did against the Latinizing influence of Justinian and the earlier emperors of the eastern Rome. The Normans, when they conquered England, found it an easy matter to encroach largely on the Saxon speech of the people, and to form a mixed language—the modern English—out of Anglo-Saxon and Frenchified Latin; but to any occupation of the linguistic ground of literary Greece by the language of the Turks, the Greek mind was as much opposed as its Christian conscience was to the creed of Mohammed; so that, from the time of the Council of Florence in the fifteenth century down to Coray at the date of the French Revolution, through Tricoupis, Paparegopoulos, and Rangabé to Bikellas and Polylas and Roides in our own times, we have an uninterrupted flow of living Greek.

These being the facts that stare even the superficial observer in the face, what possible reason, I ask, can there be for throwing an artificial hindrance in the way of our converse with this noble, self-sustaining people, by treating their language in a purely bookish fashion, as if it were Syriac or Aramaic? Assuredly it is high time for our influential men at Oxford and Cambridge to put an end to such a gross violation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the laws of philological science and international comity. Porson, the greatest perhaps among English Hellenists, and Jelf, one of the most accredited of Greek grammarians, insist in the most indubitable terms that Greek should be spoken with exact observance of the accents put on the words by the Alexandrian grammarians two hundred and fifty years before Christ, and handed down to us through the Church service and the living speech of the people for a period of more than two thousand years; and yet we persist in treating Greek as we treat no other language. Italian, French, German, and Spanish get fair play; while Greek must be content to have its orthoepy expounded in abstract rules, so neglected and inverted in practice as to make it, in the mouth of an Englishman, utterly unintelligible to the noble people from whom we are proud to have borrowed it.

So much for the hindrances in the way of fact or imagination that prevent Greece from being so largely betravelled by English tourists as many less interesting countries. Let us now plant ourselves on the ground, and first, naturally, at Athens, at once the centre of the national life and the most convenient starting-point for the tourist. And what do we find here? In 1836, Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, then head-master of Harrow School, wrote of the great city, the world-famous stage of Periclean statesmanship and Phidian art, as follows:—

"The town of Athens is now lying in ruins. The streets are almost deserted; nearly all the houses are without roofs. The churches are reduced to bare walls and heaps of stones and mortar. There is but one church in which the service is performed. A few new wooden houses, one or two of more solid structure, and the two lines of planked sheds which form the bazar are all the inhabited dwellings that Athens can now boast. So slowly does it recover from the effects of the late war. . . . In this state of modern desolation, the grandeur of the ancient buildings which still survive here is more striking, their preservation is more wonderful. There is now scarcely any building at Athens in so perfect a state as the temple of Theseus. The least ruined objects here are some of the Ruins themselves."

Five years later, in MacCulloch's "Geographical Dictionary," we find it stated that this nest of ruins was a flourishing small town of 17,000 inhabitants. And what is it now? According to the most recent authoritative tables, published by Mr. R. A. H. Bickford-Smith, its population in the year 1889 was 114,355, having, in round numbers, sextupled in the space of fifty years. Nor does this increase stand alone. Volo, a seaport town in the east of Thessaly, in ten years, from 1879 to 1889, nearly trebled its population, and Tricala—the classical Tricca—increased in the same proportion. The small ruined village has thus

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grown before our eyes to a large city; a city not so large certainly as Liverpool, or Birmingham, or even Newcastle,—great English centres of commerce and manufactures,—but as large as the metropolis of the northeast of Scotland, the city [Aberdeen] that draws its granite length so gracefully between the Dee and the Don.

The growth of population in Manchester, Liverpool, and other English towns, from the beginning of the eighteenth century downward, is notable enough; but this upstarting of a ruined village into a mighty city before the eyes of a single generation deserves special attention. To understand it we must bear in mind that, though the Greeks had been miserably down-trodden by the Turks for four hundred years; the best hope of the people borne by an unholy tribute far away from their mothers' homes, and trained into the tools of an inhuman tyranny; and though, had it not been for the "untoward event" at Navarino, the whole population of the Morea would have been exterminated beneath the merciless tramp of Turkish hoofs; there nevertheless lived, behind the outward show of slavish debasement, a heart of sturdy independence, that cherished the patriotic memories of ages, and seized eagerly on every chance that might enable it to stand before the world in the attitude and character that had given it the most prominent place in the history of the human race. The two years' struggle that gave to Greece the right to look Europe in the face, as a noble people determined to die rather than live the slaves of a hateful tyranny, at the same time gave to Europe the assurance that Greece was living Greece again; and Christian conscience and classic memories combined, when once the yoke was broken, to enable the Greeks to show to the world that, in spite of the bombshells of Venice and the sabres of Turkey, not only should a Greek mother bear sons to grow up free from the rapine of Turkish hands, but desolate Athens should rise to her old position, and, along with Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen, assert its place among famous European cities that combine commercial enterprise with cultivated intelligence. It was this noble patriotic pride that, in the short space of half a century, turned the little ruined village into an imposing city.

Nor is it difficult to see by what steps of sure ascent this noble ambition to be their own best selves again has been so splendidly gratified. The Greeks, though extinguished politically by the Osmanli irruption in 1453, were never conquered intellectually and morally: they were bound, but they were not paralyzed. The Turk could rule by the sabre, as the violent blast rules the ship in storm; but when quiet came, and not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rude force, but active intelligence was required, he was glad to employ, as useful ministers in the sphere of public business, the very men whom, in the lower sphere of political submission, he had treated as slaves. In this way the Greeks of the Fanar in Constantinople often became the most influential and effective governors of the half-conquered provinces of the Turk; and so, while externally doing duty for him, were silently and effectively preparing the way for the happy hour when a favorable chance might enable them to throw off their gilded chains, and stand before their Eastern oppressors in the same attitude of manly independence that Leonidas and his Spartans assumed at Thermopylæ.

But not only in the capital of the Turkish rule was there a special sort of expectant Greek nationality, under the outward recognition of the Turk, but all over Europe, in Asia Minor, and in Africa, there were colonies of expatriated Greeks, waiting and working for the hour of national regeneration. The Greeks in modern as in ancient times had never been slow to use the advantages, commercial and naval, which their varied coast and richly islanded seas presented; and, while in classical times Salamis and Eurymedon taught the Persians to confine themselves within the natural cincture of the Tigris and Euphrates, in recent times the names of Canaris and Miaulis and the Hydriotes taught a similar lesson to the Turks, who were destined to lay the corner-stone of Greek independence by the "happy blunder" of Navarino. Not at Hydra only, at Scio, at Psara and Parga, were colonies of patriotic and high-spirited Greeks, ever ready to take up arms and lay down life when the call of Providence should blow a blast of liberation in their ears; but in all the centres of commercial activity in the Mediterranean and the Adriatic,—in Smyrna, in Alexandria, at Livorno, at Venice, and Trieste,—a strength of Greek nationality was being nursed, ready to start into efficient manhood, the moment a vulnerable point was opened in the mail of their hereditary oppressors. Of this expectant patriotism the Greek churches in England—in London, Liverpool, and Manchester—remain to the present hour speaking witnesses. Such and so numerous was the class of Greeks,—outside of Greece bodily, but intensely beating with the warm pulses of patriotism,—who, from the moment of the publicly recognized independence of the fatherland, looked to the ruins of Athens as the natural soil into which their liberal patriotism was to cast the seed of a swift resurrection. Forthwith funds were supplied with which schools and colleges, museums, and benevolent associations of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all kinds were set in motion; and when to this were added the palatial display of the young kingdom beneath the Acropolis, and the commercial opportunities of the adjacent Piræus, the charm worked so potently that in the course of half a century a rotten old Turkish village rose into a position of honorable rivalry with the fairest cities of western Europe.

And now let the human-hearted student of social fates take his station for a minute on this ground so miraculously recovered from barbarism; and look around. All the world is loud in praise of the beauty of "the modern Athens," commonly called Edinburgh; and though this epithet was given to our Scottish capital more from a notion of intellectual relationship, than of topographical coincidence, there can be no doubt that the latter element in the comparison exists. The great advantage of Edinburgh consists in its preserving the natural lines of the elevated situation on which lie its main streets, open, not only freely and grandly to east and west, but, with recurrent openings to the north, commanding a fair and far view of the high ground on both sides of the Forth. With this wonderful combination of rural and urban charm, the Greek Athens may not dare to compete. Still, there are in both cities striking points of similarity, which may serve to give a preference to the topographical source of the popular designation, so currently given to the Dunedin of the old Celtic stronghold. Let the traveller in Athens take his stand before the beautiful temple of Theseus, and, looking southward, he will, point after point, command the same view of the Hellenic city as that of Edinburgh presented to the eye of one of its citizens looking in a similar direction from Fettes College. Directly in front of the Attic traveller rises the hill of Mars, with the adjacent Acropolis crowned with the Doric strength of the Parthenon and the Doric grace of the pillars still bearing the name of the most ancient Attic king, Erechtheus, who stands in the same relation to Pericles as Abraham did to David and the flourishing Jewish monarchy under his wise son. To this, in the Scottish Athens, the Castle rock, with its military towers, the Armoury Hall, and other lofty buildings sloping down to the Scottish Bank, and the cathedralic crown of St. Giles, correspond. Then to the left, for Lycabettus in the classical picture, we have Arthur's Seat; for the Ilissus, the Water of Leith rushing grandly beneath Douglas Crescent, with an environment of palatial hospitals unequalled in the three kingdoms. Beyond the city bounds, southward and southwestward, we have in Edinburgh, corresponding to the honeyed Hymettus of classical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Greece, the Pentland Hills, sacred to the memory of the defenders of freedom of conscience in the days of the Stuarts; and, turning round in an opposite direction, we have in Greece Pentelicus and, beyond that westward, the mountain ranges of Thebes and Megara, corresponding to the East and West Lomonds and the Ochil range in Fife. Then, of course, in the comparison we must not forget that the Piræus stands in the same relation to the classic Athens that Leith does to Edinburgh; the distance of four miles from the city being compensated by the steam transit of the railway, which, wherever it appears, turns miles into minutes, and physical distances into social identities.

In this topographical planting of the Scottish beside the Hellenic Athens, while there can be little doubt that, if only by virtue of Princes Street and its outlooks, the palm in respect of pictorial effect must be given to the northern competitor, on the other hand, in wealth of historical retrospect, the relation of the ancient to the modern Athens is that of a giant to a dwarf. From Margaret, the sainted spouse of Malcolm Canmore, to Kirkcaldy of Grange, and the stout presentation of our great Reformer, John Knox, to the seductive grace of the fair Queen Mary at Holyrood, the parallel line of the old Edinburgh, facing the architectural splendor of Princes Street, carries with it, to a purely Scottish eye, memories of the past as rich and as precious as the circle of heroic traditions which holds the mind captive when contemplating the Acropolis and the hill of Mars from the vestibule of the temple of Theseus; but in world-wide significance and in the record of the Clio of all times and places, the names of Theseus and Miltiades, of Themistocles and Pericles and Phidias, outweigh all that the rich story of Scottish manhood can number from Bannockburn to Drumclog and Prestonpans.

Nor is it only within the precincts of the city walls that the ground of the classical Athens teems at every step with a significance with which no other European city, not even colossal Rome, can vie; but all around, in every direction, mighty monuments, whether in the form of white marble columns or in the more eloquent form of shattered ruins, tell a tale that can perish only with the world to which they belong. Fronting the eye as it looks southward from any lofty position in the city is the island of Salamis, corresponding in situation to Inchkeith, or the Isle of May, in our Scottish Athens; and jutting out with a sharp projection into the sea, corresponding pretty much to St. Abb's Head in the landscape of the Lothians and Berwickshire, is Sunium, with the pillared shrine of the patron goddess of Athens,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pallas Athene, supreme in celestial wisdom, as Jove was in power. Turning this far-viewed promontory and tramping northward some thirty or forty miles, we plant our feet on the plain of Marathon, a name which stands in the same relation to the political fates of Europe that Jerusalem does to its religious story; for had it not been for Marathon, five hundred years before Christ, Persia might have strangled Greek freedom in the cradle, and Rome might have had to fight her ground with an Asiatic, as she did later on with an African, Hannibal. Then, shooting southwestward under the shade of Pentelicus and Parnassus, the traveller can return to Athens by Eleusis, a name as sacred to the ancient world as Papal Rome was to the Catholic Europe of the Middle Ages, and of which the great Roman orator says, that it taught a doctrine which was the mother of all higher civilization, and enabled those who were initiated in its mysteries to live with a purer joy and to die with a brighter hope.[1]

Let us now cast a glance at the social and political state of this most interesting of reconstituted kingdoms. And first, of agriculture. In Greece, as in every well-constituted country, the cultivation of the ground by an industrious and intelligent peasantry is the primary condition of a healthy nationality. It does not make the most show, but is, nevertheless, the base of the pillars that support the cornice and the pediment. In this important department, though Greece stands by no means so high as most of the older and more firmly rooted European states, it exhibits on the whole, since the accession of King George, satisfactory marks of progress. In the four most important fields of agriculture,—corn, currants, vines, and olives,—Mr. Bickford-Smith reports the following increase of cultivated ground during a period of twenty-seven years; viz, 1860, 2,322,524 stremmata[2]; 1887, 6,863,666 stremmata. This is good; nevertheless, all our travellers agree in depicting the working-power and the rural style of operations in Greece as far from model. This was indeed only what was to be expected in a country groaning for centuries under the domination of a foreign despotism, and deprived of the fatherly superintendence of a native proprietorship.

So much for the land. But the element on which the strength and glory of the Greek people, from Themistocles and Cimon down to Canaris and Miaulis, has been displayed, is the sea; not only, as these names indicate, in significant epochs of national struggle, but in the adventurous and gainful march of commerce in times of peace.

[1] Cicero; *De Legibus*, ii, 14. [2] A stremma is equivalent to .219 of an acre.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This, of course, was just what was to be anticipated from the combined action of circling waters on all sides of the country and of intelligent and enterprising Greek settlers in all the principal commercial centres of Asia, Africa, Italy, Russia, and England. On this subject Mr. Bickford-Smith waxes eloquent, and spreads forth the whole flattering summary of Hellenic commercial strength in the fifth chapter of his valuable book; but my limits permit me only to state the general result of his naval tabulation in a single sentence. "Before the revolution," he says, "Greece had about 60,000 tons of shipping, but was left in 1833 with very few ships; Galaxidi, for instance, being reduced from two hundred and fifty ships to ninety. In 1891, she had reached a total of ninety-three steamboats, of 46,688 tons, and 4,772 sailing vessels, of 228,976 tons." On this head, therefore, there is no doubtful balance-sheet. Whether at the Piræus or Galaxidi, at Smyrna or Trieste, Greece will know to rule the waters with which nature has so liberally encompassed her shores.

But a more difficult matter than commerce for new Greece, and, so far as compact nationality is concerned, a more important matter, is government; government and the growth of years, the rudder without the sure management of which the good ship may in one gusty moment be driven on a rock and wrecked. On this, therefore, every lover of revived Hellas must fix his most serious regard. The detailed account of the sad story of recurring misgovernment and revolt in Greece, during the thirty-five years that elapsed from the Presidency of Capo d'Istria in 1828 to the accession of the present King of Greece in 1863, will be found in Finlay, Sergeant, and other writers on the social position and fortunes of the Greeks of to-day. The character of the whole of that unhappy period may be summed up in a few sentences. In the first place, it must be borne in mind that Greece being, both by its geographical formation and historical traditions, a democratic country, and at the era of the great Liberation war owing its independence to the self-assertion of individual patriots incapable of combination for common action, presented a political problem of unusual difficulty when unity of action was the demand of the hour. Greece was Greece again by the "happy blunder" of Navarino,—a recognized, distinct factor in the complex body of European states. But the body must have a head; and for a head,—having among themselves no man of pure Greek blood, who could represent Hellas as grandly as Garibaldi did Italy,—the National Assembly elected Count Capo d'Istria, a Russianizing Corfiote, to be the President of the associated states of liberated Greece.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of course, no more difficult political position can be imagined. A strong arm and a kindly hand—a rare combination in rulers—were equally necessary for success in the management of a people proud of their national history and hot with the spur of recent successful revolt against hereditary tyranny. Capo d'Istria did not recognize this: he would wield the mace of his Presidency like the sceptre of an absolute monarch: and, after a wild year or two of fret and violence, paid for the abuse of power by the penalty of death. On October 9, 1831, he was assassinated as he went to hear mass in the church of St. Spiridion at Nauplia. An ugly business; but political government in troubled times deals in blood, just as gusty skies and rainy spouts deal in mud: a most ill-omened start for the march of free Greece into the arena of European politics; but the bloody omen of the first step was more than matched by the flagrant folly of the next. The Greeks had sense enough to know that, as a people, they were essentially democratic; yet, partly from the necessity of the case, and partly from a desire to gain the confidence of the great European Powers, they determined to change their Presidency into a Kingship, and gave the Powers authority to choose a monarch for the Kingdom of revived Greece. And whom did the Powers choose? A young German *bursch* just escaped from school, a green Bavarian boy of seventeen. He arrived at Nauplia on February 6, 1833, in an English frigate. Of course such an unpractised stripling could not play the full-grown man anywhere, much less enact the part of a wise king in a troubled country; so a brigade of Bavarian notables, headed by Count Armansperg, was sent with him, who succeeded in misgoverning that unfortunate country on the principles of German officialism and centralization for nine years, when, in 1843, they were dismissed with general satisfaction and without assassination. The boy-king then accepted the limitation of a constitutional government, of which his dismissed ministry had known nothing. From that period onward, the Bavarian princeling made a trial of governing for himself, but proved unequal to so slippery a business. His German ideas of ruling did not suit Greeks; so he too, in 1862, received notice to quit, and the following year, the present monarch, King George of Denmark, walked in.

After this, to the present date [1894], we have over thirty years of comparatively fair sailing, during which the good ship of the Hellenic state, if not altogether without danger, has managed to steer clear of the rocks which ruined the Capo-d'Istrian and the Bavarian governments.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And, in spite of many disadvantages, the government of King George presents itself to Europe in an attitude of stability that gives good hope for the future. Personally the monarch has known to maintain his authority firmly in the *via media*, without either asserting his kingly prerogative too stoutly on the one hand, or shrinking timidly before the gusts of political factions on the other. This, under the most favorable conditions, is no small praise; but is especially praiseworthy under the conditions of political life as they exist in the Hellenic traditions, and under the action of the Constitution of 1863, sworn to by the monarch on his acceptance of the throne. These conditions and this Constitution imply three things: universal manhood suffrage; legislation by a single chamber, untempered by the salutary check of an Upper House; and, worst of all perhaps, an army of professional politicians far outnumbering the public need, and living on the pay and place which it is the privilege of the party in power to distribute. Under such a system, the natural nurse of faction, the throne of a king is, of course, no easy seat; and that King George has sat upon it now for more than thirty years without any recurrence of the social earthquakes that shook his predecessors, must be attributed to his own good sense, in the first place, but partly also to his good luck in having united himself to a Russian princess. Greek in her ecclesiastical kinship, womanly and kind in her social relations, and—better even than these qualifications—having presented her royal lord with young princes and a princess, the growth of Greek soil, thus guaranteeing the proud young nation against the degradation and the danger of having to beg from door to door of haughty European courts for a king,—the Greeks have reason to be gratified with their monarch's choice.

But at the present moment, as already stated, the grand difficulty with which revived Greece has to struggle is not so much democracy, or other one-sidedness in the Constitution, but simply the national debt and the finance. This is a matter which outweighs all others, both in embarrassment for the present and in apprehension for the future of this brave little kingdom; and it is extremely difficult at a distance to form a reliable judgment on the state of affairs. Through this atmosphere of painful doubt, however, there is a bright ray of hope cast from the report of two of the best informed specialists on the subject of Greek finance: the one is M. Joseph D. Beckmann, in his "Les Finances de la Grèce: étude composée sur la base de documents authentiques," published at Athens, in November, 1892, and of which the substance is given in three detailed chapters by Mr. Bickford-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Smith; and the other is Mr. Law, in his important "Report on the present economical and financial position of Greece," presented to both Houses of Parliament, April, 1893. From Beckmann, Bickford-Smith tabulates the following reassuring points:—

"(1) Though Greece has borrowed a large amount of money, she has something to show for it: Thessaly, many miles of roads, many miles of railways, a respectable little navy, and a very rapidly developed commerce.

(2) Her budgets have been gradually improving, and are now nearly in stable equilibrium."

And Mr. Law sums up the general heads of his report in even more hopeful terms.

The remaining points that call for notice in a summary view of the social state of revived Greece are: religion, education, literature, and language. Fortunately the facts in these departments are so certain and so prominent that a very few words will amply satisfy the impartial enquirer. First, in regard to the Church, there is reason to fear that, though Hellas is happily free from the sacerdotal conceit and the unreasonable dogmatism of the Roman Pope, neither in point of intelligence, nor in the moral influence that belongs to a healthy Christian Church, does she realize the ideal which, from the past history of her Church, and the positive danger of a godless contagion from France, she might reasonably be expected to cherish. On the urgent necessity of reform from within, Mr. Bickford-Smith is very emphatic.

On education and culture, there is but one voice; a voice calling aloud to all intelligent hearers, that it is both the ambition and the practice of modern Greeks to present themselves to the world in an intellectual garb not unworthy of their classical descent. They have a just pride in the memory that, whatever may have been their position in the political world at various critical periods of their history, intellectually through their wisdom, and morally through Christianity, they have always conquered their conquerors, have even commanded the respect of the sanguinary Turk. One of the first things, perhaps the one good thing, that the Bavarian boy-king did, when seated on the throne, was to establish a complete array of free national schools, in four degrees,—after the model of Germany,—from the humblest infant-school to the proud platform of the National University. Since the date of the Bavarian regency great changes in the schools have taken place, more after the French than the German example; but, whether French or German, all agree that the popular education in the Greece of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to-day is, as regards character and completeness, in no respect inferior to that of the most highly cultivated countries of Europe. So little, indeed, have foreign critics discovered in it to find fault with, that they have paraded excess as its main defect, and no doubt with a certain amount of justice. It is not only in Greece, but in this country [Scotland] and elsewhere, that young persons are sometimes educated above the level to which their social destiny points; but this is a danger perhaps inseparable at the first start from a general elevation of the intellectual platform of a whole people; and especially in a people with such intellectual precedents as the Greeks.

It remains to wind up this rapid outline of the wonderful history of revived and regenerate Greece by a single word on the relation of modern Greece to the world of books,—a world which the most intellectual of all peoples have gloried to claim as peculiarly their own. Greek, with an altogether unique vitality, is, in fact, as I started with saying, the only living bridge that connects the memories of the great Past of the human race with the promise of the great Present. The names of Zosimus and Zonaras, of Acominates, Nicander, Nucius, and Phranzes, to all who are even superficially acquainted with the authorities on which our most interesting mediæval history is based, indicate clearly enough the line of literary continuity which binds into a historical whole the intellectual life of the Greek people, from Diodorus, Polybius, and the early Church fathers downward to the ill-omened capture of Constantinople by the Turks in the middle of the fifteenth century. But this baleful overthrow of their political independence did in no wise cause the enslavement of their souls. The chains which bound the body could not reach the soul. A single glance into a volume of Greek history will show how little the eagle of the soaring Greek intellect had been taught to droop its wings when the political Jove, whom it had served, was dethroned by the Turk. Then, as for the living power of Greek literature in the century which commenced with Coray, thirty years before the epoch of national resurrection in 1821, the least that can be said is, that the spokesmen of Greek thought during that period were in every way worthy of their great ancestors. The names of the distinguished Greek writers mentioned above, and a host of others, point to the pages of a great living drama, as rich in human interest and in social significance as the most valued chapter of Herodotus or Xenophon, of Polybius or Diodorus.

In conclusion, as to the type and character of the language in which the modern Greek intellect has so richly expressed itself, it would re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quire a separate article of a purely philological character to deal with it fully. Meanwhile it may be sufficient to warn the general reader against lending his ear to the vulgar assertion that Greek, if not a dead language, is at least so corrupt that the study of it would tend rather to injure than to promote the study of the Greek of the great classical period. This notion proceeds either from gross ignorance or more gross conceit, or perhaps, on a more charitable interpretation, from a confounding of the Greek of the local ballads with the Greek of educated men,—a comparison just as misleading as it would be in a student of English to confound the local dialect of Lancashire, or the phraseology of Scottish song, with the style of Tennyson or the London "Times." Then as to corruption: That is a vague word; but how it can be, with any propriety, applied to a language which is characterized by an almost superstitious horror of any strange word of Turkish, or Italian, or French extraction, it is difficult to understand. The few slight changes which differentiate the Greek of living Greek writers from the so-called classical Greek of the ancients, are merely as the lopping off of a few superfluous branches from a tree of exuberant growth,—a loss amply compensated by the daily addition of fresh branches from its own native root, a procedure diametrically opposed to the sewing together, in a crude style, of borrowed scraps and patches so characteristic of our mixed English tongue. Lastly, let the young Hellenist who wishes to shake hands and hearts in a kindly human and a nobly Christian style with the living Greeks of to-day, know by practice, that living speech, and not dead grammar, is the oracle from whom he must learn. The living alliance of mind and ear and speech, acting on interesting objects in the immediate surroundings of the learner, with daily practice, will produce a more intimate familiarity with any foreign tongue in five months than will a purely bookish regimen in as many years. "Vixere fortes ante Agamemnon"—"Brave men lived before Agamemnon"; and with great results men spoke eloquently before books or printed paper were known. Books, though extremely useful in a subsidiary way to supply the deficiencies of direct personal observation and experience, when substituted for these are unnatural and pernicious; and their direct action, as Plato taught long ago in the "Phædrus," is to weaken the memory, to dull the ear, and to change the music of a sounding voice into the mute service of a peeping eye.

JOHN STUART BLACKIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED